

THE
CHRISTIAN QUARTERLY.

JANUARY, 1870.

I.—THE CREED QUESTION.

CREEDS are the generalizations of the Church's history. They are the formal statements of its faith—the outward expressions of its subjective condition during its progress through the ages. Hence, to study creeds is to study the Church in its development to its present position in the world.

There has been considerable amount of loose and ill-advised declamation against creeds. The wholesale manner in which they have been disposed of involves consequences which need not be incurred by a more prudent and judicious course. In fact, the Church must have a creed. Its central idea requires this. It is to "walk by faith, not by sight." It must, therefore, have something in which to believe; something that will satisfy the conditions of the Christian life. This, whatever it is, will be a creed, and will fairly represent the faith of the Church at the time of its adoption. Hence the different creeds which have been adopted since the foundation of the Church have, at least, a historic value, as they enable us to measure the departures that have been made from the simple faith of the first Christians. This is knowledge of the first importance in any comprehensive and useful discussion of the question now under consideration.

As a brief notice of creeds is essential to the argument which we propose in this paper, we will begin with that which appears first in the history of the Church. This we shall denominate

Vol. II.—1

THE DIVINE CREED.

The Apostle Peter, in his answer to the inquiry of Christ, "But who say ye that I am?" made the first formal Confession of Faith under the Christian dispensation. The answer, "*Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God*,"* was regarded by the Savior as containing all that was essential to the foundation of His kingdom upon earth. Hence he said, "Upon this rock I will build my Church, and the gates of Hades shall not prevail against it." In the record of that most touching interview between Jesus and the sisters of Lazarus, Martha expresses substantially the same thing, when she says, "*I believe Thou art the Christ, the Son of God, which should come into the world*."† These statements give the concise, yet perspicuous and comprehensive creed of the New Testament—that which every man must subscribe who would become a member of the Church of God. And, with this fact before us, there is singular force and beauty in John's summary of his memoirs of Jesus, "And many other signs truly did Jesus in the presence of his disciples, which are not written in this book: but these are written, that you might believe that *Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God*; and that believing, you might have life through his name."‡

If we now turn to the preaching of the Apostles, we shall find that they recognized, as the creed of the Church, what is contained in the foregoing statements. What did these divinely-appointed ministers require the people to believe? Evidently whatever was preached—no more, no less. What, then, did the Apostles preach? For, if we can learn what this was, we can know what the people were to believe; and this will be the exact measure of the Confession of Faith required.

In the second chapter of Acts we have a record of the first sermon preached under the Great Commission. In that sermon, Peter preached substantially the same thing as contained in the Confession which he had formerly made. He preached Christ—the Gospel—told the simple story of the Cross; that Jesus had died for our sins, according to the Scriptures, was buried, and rose again, and that God had constituted Him "both Lord and Christ."

* Matt. xvi, 16.

† John xi, 22.

‡ John xx, 30, 31.

Again, in the third chapter of Acts, we have the same Apostle preaching, in substance, the very same thing. The people hear what is propounded for their acceptance, and, in the fourth chapter, it is declared that "many of them, that heard the word, believed." In the eighth chapter of the same book, we learn that Philip preached *Christ* to the Samaritans and *Jesus* to the Ethiopian Eunuch. In the tenth chapter, we have a record of the conversion of the first Gentile family. The same Apostle who announced the glad-tidings on the day of Pentecost to the Jews is present here, to open the kingdom to the Gentiles also. And, although nearly eight years have passed away since the "beginning at Jerusalem," Peter has no new gospel to preach, no new conditions of membership to propose. He tells the same story "which was published throughout all Judea, and began from Galilee, after the baptism which John preached; how God anointed Jesus of Nazareth with the Holy Ghost, and with power: who went about doing good, and healing all that were oppressed of the devil; for God was with Him. And we are witnesses of all things which he did, both in the land of the Jews and in Jerusalem; whom they slew and hanged on a tree; Him God raised up the third day, and showed him openly: not to all the people, but unto witnesses chosen before of God, *even* to us, who did eat and drink with him after he rose from the dead. And he commanded us to preach unto the people, and to testify that it is he which was ordained of God to be the judge of quick and dead. To him give all the prophets witness, that, through his name, whosoever BELIEVETH IN HIM shall receive remission of sins."* We do not wonder, now, when the Philippian jailer cried out, "Sirs, what must I do to be saved?" that Paul and Silas said to him, "*Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved, and thy house.*"†

From this cursory review of the Acts of the Apostles, it must be evident to every candid mind that the inspired preachers required the people to believe only in Christ—"Him of whom Moses and the prophets did write"—and that a simple statement, affirming the Messiahship of Jesus, was the sum total of the creed of the New Testament Church. It should be observed, also, that the hearty reception of this creed was an essential condition of entrance

* Acts x, 37-43.

† Acts xvi, 31.

into that Church. "He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved." "If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayest." "Believe on the Lord Jesus Christ, and thou shalt be saved," etc. This was the character of the language used by the inspired teachers to all who inquired the way into the kingdom. Hence, the Gospel which the Apostles preached, so far as it is related to faith, was all contained in the proposition upon which Christ said he would build his Church—"Thou art the Christ, the Son of the Living God." And it can not be questioned by any intelligent student of the Scriptures, that the substance of this formula was made the measure of every man's faith, who sought for admission into the Primitive Church.

THE PURPOSE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

It may assist us, at this point, to remember that even the New Testament was not the creed of the earliest Christians. This is evident from the fact that it was not written till several years after the Gospel had been preached, and thousands had been gathered into the Church. And it is further evident, because the New Testament is not in the form of a creed, and could never have been intended for such a purpose. It *contains* the creed of the Church, but is itself no more that creed, in any proper sense, than the Old Testament is. A proper understanding of this fact will do much to clear up the whole creed difficulty in the minds of many who do not now see clearly any true solution of it. Let us, then, consider the New Testament in its proper divisions:

I. The memoirs of Jesus—embraced in Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John.

II. Acts of the Apostles—the sayings and doings of those to whom the Great Commission was given.

III. Letters of the Apostles to the Churches, containing instructions to those who had already believed, and entered the kingdom.

IV. The Apocalypse—or a view of the struggles and triumphs of the Church in its history.

It will be seen from this classification that the New Testament is not in the form of a creed, but simply contains:

1. That which is the creed of the Church—the proposition that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the Living God.

2. The history of the development of this proposition in the life of Jesus.

3. The proof upon which its divine character rests.

4. A practical exhibition of its use during the Apostolic Ministry.

5. An enforcement of the obligations which it imposes upon all those who subscribe it.

6. A prophecy concerning the apostasy of the Church from this simple faith, and the final restoration of the primitive creed as the foundation of "the new heavens and the new earth."

This analysis enables us to see that the purpose of the New Testament is to furnish mankind with this creed; to give its history and the proof of its divinity, and urge upon all who accept it the solemn duties which it imposes. And the propriety of this will appear obvious to any one who will consider the fact that the value of all that is written in the New Testament depends upon what is announced as the foundation of the Church. When we believe in Christ, we accept all that he has said as divine, and consequently as *authoritative*. His word, then, becomes law to us—an infallible rule of action. If He was what he claimed to be, then the New Testament is what it claims to be; but if he was an impostor, it is certainly a "cunningly-devised fable," and entirely unworthy our confidence. Hence that which is addressed to our faith is the *divinity* of Christ; while that which determines our action is the *authority* of Christ. But his authority depends on his divinity. 'If He is divine, his word is binding on all his followers, and every commandment in that word must be implicitly obeyed. We conclude, therefore, that it is not strictly proper to say the New Testament is our creed, but we can say *it is our rule of duty*. We *believe* in Christ because we are convinced that he is divine; we *obey* him because the acknowledgment of his divinity concedes his right to command. Hence the proposition affirming the Messiahship of Jesus is the *creed* of the Church—the foundation upon which the Church is built—while all else in the New Testament in some way relates to this primary truth. This view of the matter turns the mind away from every other question, to consider that one which is most vital in the Christian religion, namely, "What think ye of Christ, whose son is he?" This question is fundamental, and a proper answer to it will

give us the only divinely authorized Confession of Faith that the world has ever known since the introduction of Christianity.*

ANCIENT HUMAN SYMBOLS.

Having now seen what the divine creed is, it will be necessary, in order to carry out our purpose, to take a brief notice of some of the human creeds that have come down to us through the history of the Church. We think that a comparison of the Divine with the human will not only show the superiority of the one over the other, but will also help us to understand the utter folly of men attempting to construct a Confession of Faith that will be suitable to every creature.

Symbolum Apostolicum.

One of the most ancient, as well as the most beautiful, of the human symbols, is the one commonly called "The Apostles' Creed." This was formerly held to have been made by the Apostles themselves. One writer, Rufinus, who wrote the latter part of the third century, says :

"There was an ancient tradition that the Apostles, being about to depart from Jerusalem, first settled a rule for their future preaching ; lest, after they were separated from each other, they should expound different doctrines to those whom they invited to the Christian faith. Wherefore, being all assembled together, and filled with the Holy Ghost, they composed this short rule of their preaching, each one contributing his sentence, and left it as a rule to be given to all believers."†

* Before scientific theology, under the form of γνώσις, developed itself with the aid of philosophical speculation, the faith of the Apostles was firmly and historically established as πίστις, by bringing together those elements (στοιχεῖα) of Christian doctrine which were accounted essential. The κήρυγμα ἀποστολικόν, the παράδοσις ἀποστολική, was first transmitted by oral traditions, and afterward appeared in a written form ! What is commonly called the Apostles' Creed (Apostolic Symbol) is most probably composed of various confessions of faith, used by the Primitive Church in the baptismal service. Though it did not proceed from the Apostles themselves, yet it preserved the principles of Apostolic tradition in broad general outlines."—*Hagenbach's History of Doctrines*, vol. i, p. 52.

† Harvey, *Eccl. Angel. Vindex*, I, 555 ; Bingham, *Orig. Eccl.*, bk. X, ch. 3.

NOTE.—A writer, under the name of Augustine, pretends to tell us what article was contributed by each Apostle. Peter said, "I believe in God, the Father Almighty ;" John, "maker of Heaven and Earth ;" James, "and in Jesus Christ, his only son our Lord ;" Andrew, "who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary ;" Philip, "suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried ;" Thomas, "He descended into hell ; the third day he rose again from the dead ;" Bartholomew, "He ascended into heaven, and sitteth at the right hand of God the Father Almighty ;" Matthew, "From thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead." James, the son of Alphaeus, added, "I believe in the Holy Ghost ; the holy Catholic Church ;" Simon Zelotes, "the communion of saints ; the forgiveness of sins ;" Jude, the brother of James, "the resurrection of the body ;" Matthias, "the life everlasting."

But whatever may have been the opinion formerly, concerning the authorship of this ancient creed, it is now almost universally conceded that it is not the work of the Apostles.* In fact, its present form differs from what it was in the early history of the Church; and as we now have it, it is certainly not older than the fourth century. Its present form is as follows, with the Latin in the margin:

"I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and in Jesus Christ his only Son our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost; born of the Virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, dead, and buried; he descended into hell; the third day he rose from the dead; he ascended into heaven, and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost; the holy Catholic Church; the communion of saints; the forgiveness of sins; the resurrection of the body; and the life everlasting. Amen."†

Notwithstanding Augustine calls this creed "*Regula fidei brevis et grandis; brevis numero verborum, grandis pondere sententiarum*," it nevertheless contains several additions to the Divine creed. And even the statement concerning Christ is an expansion of the statement of Peter, and greatly weakens the force, as well as mars the beauty, of the original.

This creed is especially important, because it shows that the nearer we approach the Apostolic period the fewer are the specula-

*The Apostles' Creed can not, of itself, be a Supreme and ultimate authority, because, although in substance apostolic, yet both in its original and its present form, it is a post-apostolic production. It has, to be sure, been maintained as, even in its present form, a work of the Apostles, or even of our Lord himself. But in reply to such an unhistorical assertion, we only need to point, in the first place, to the complete silence of the New Testament concerning it; and, in the second place, to the unrefuted and irrefutable disclosures that have often been made concerning the various forms which this symbol is found to have had in the early Church; forms which, it is true, agree in substance, but by no means give all the parts of the symbol completely, while those that are given are not in all equally complete. From this it is evident that the creed was not handed down by the Apostles from the beginning in a finished form, but is the result of various attempts to preach the substance of what the Apostles taught; finally assuming the fixed form which now the whole Church adopts. (Martensen's *Christian Dogmatics*, pp. 35, 36. See also Schaff's *History of the Apostolic Church*, p. 568; Hinds' *Early Christianity*, pt. III, ch. VI; Proctor's *One Common Prayer*, p. 227; Guericke's *All. Christl. Symbolik*, ¶ 12; Cunningham's *Historical Theology*, ch. III; Shedd's *History of Doctrines*, bk. VII, ch. I, ¶ 2.)

†"Credo in Deum, Patrem omnipotentem, Creatorem cœli et terræ. Et in Jesum Christum, filium ejus unicum, dominum nostrum; qui conceptus est de Spiritu Sancto; natus ex Maria virgine; Passus sub Pontio Pilato; crucifixus, mortuus et sepultus; descendit ad inferna; tertia die resurrexit a mortuis; ascendit ad cœlos; sedet ad dexteram Dei Patris omnipotentis; inde venturus est judicare vivos et mortuos. Credo in Spiritum Sanctum; sanctam ecclesiam catholicam, sanctorum communionem; remissionem peccatorum; carnis resurrectionem; et vitam æternam. Amen."

tive elements found in the symbols of the Church. For although the "*Symbolum Apostolicum*" is not to be preferred to the Divine creed, it is far less objectionable than the symbols subsequently adopted by the Church. Its language is simple, and its statements are generally in harmony with the Scriptures.*

There is a striking resemblance between this creed and the summaries contained in the writings of Irenæus and Tertullian. And this fact goes far to confirm the statement already made concerning the simplicity of the faith, as we approach nearer and nearer to the primitive days of the Church.

Summaries of Irenæus and Tertullian.

"The Church, though scattered through the whole habitable globe, to its utmost bounds, has received from the Apostles and their pupils the belief, in one

* Several facts of great importance, in connection with the Apostles' Creed, are worthy of notice. 1. In the Churches founded by the Apostles and their pupils, a confession of faith, and therefore the formal adoption of a creed, was required of the candidate for admission to the Church. 2. Although the department of scientific theology can hardly be said to have been formed, yet this oldest creed is very distinct concerning the essential doctrines of Christianity. The Apostles' Creed teaches the doctrine of the existence of God as Father, Son, and Holy Ghost; of the incarnation of the Son; of his atoning death; of his mediatorial power and kingdom; of the resurrection, and of the final judgment. 3. The Apostles' Creed is the earliest attempt of the Christian mind to systematize the teachings of Scripture, and is, consequently, the uninspired foundation upon which the whole after-structure of symbolic literature rests. All creed development proceeds from this germ. Being little more than a collection of Scripture phraseology, it contains fewer speculative elements than the later creeds which the Church was compelled to form, by the counter-speculation of the human mind; and yet, because it is composed wholly of Scripture data, it is capable of an indefinite expansion by the scientific mind in all ages. 4. This symbol contributed indirectly to the collection and fixing of the canon. In the first and second centuries, but very few copies of the Gospels and epistles were in existence. The ancient Church had no opportunity to peruse them, as the modern has, and, consequently, the entire Biblical knowledge of the common Christian of that period was obtained from the public reading and explanation of the religious assembly. It is easy to see that in such a condition of things, a brief compendium, or summary statement of the essential truths of Christianity, that could be committed to memory, and repeated by all, would be the best substitute for the lack of manuscripts. Hence, the confession of faith that might pass from mouth to mouth, like the *sacramentum* of the ancient soldier. But in course of time, the heretical or schismatical parties who advanced doctrines contrary to those embodied in these brief creeds, and who appealed to the Scriptures for justification, compelled the catholic defenders of the simple original creed to collect and fix the canon, and to multiply copies of it. For, in order to make out his case, the heretical or schismatical opponent of the creed cited mutilated or garbled portions of the Scripture, or writings which, like the Apocryphal Gospels and epistles, could lay no claim to inspiration. In this way the defense of the Apostolic Creed contributed to the spread and authority of the inspired writings themselves. 5. This earliest creed has been honored and adopted more generally than any other single confession of faith, by all Christian denominations. It makes part of the liturgies of the various Churches, and its doctrinal matter enters as a component into all the scientific creeds of Christendom.—*Shedd's History of Christian Doctrine*, vol. ii, pp. 433-435.

God, Father Almighty, the Maker of Heaven and earth, and the sea, and all that is in them; and in one Christ Jesus, the Son of God, who was made flesh for our salvation; and in the Holy Ghost, who, through the prophets, announced the dispensations, and the advents, and the birth from a virgin, and the passion, and the resurrection from the dead, and the incarnate ascension into Heaven of the beloved Christ Jesus, our Lord, and his reappearance (*παροσίαν*) from the Heavens, with the glory of the Father, in order to gather together into one (*ἀνακεφαλαιοῦσασθαι*, Eph. i, 10) all things, and raise every man from the grave, that to Christ Jesus, our Lord and God and Savior and King, according to the good pleasure of the Invisible Father, every knee should bow, of things in Heaven, of things in earth, and that every tongue should confess him, and that he should administer a just judgment upon all; that he should send into eternal fire evil spirits (*τὰ πνευματικὰ τῆς πονηρίας*, Eph. vi, 12), and the angels who transgressed and apostatized, and the ungodly, unjust, and lawless, and blasphemous among men, but should give immortality, and minister abundantly of eternal glory, to the just and holy, and those who have kept his commandments, and have continued in his love, graciously giving life to those who have been such from the beginning, and to those who have been such after repentance.*

"The rule of faith is one only, unchangeable, and not to be amended, namely, the belief in one sole omnipotent God, the Maker of the world; and in his Son Jesus Christ, born of the Virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate, raised from the dead on the third day, received into Heaven, seated now on the right hand of the Father, and to come hereafter to judge the living and dead, through the resurrection of the flesh."†

The Nicene Creed.

The next creed of importance was adopted at the Council of Nice, A. D. 325, which was subsequently enlarged at the second Council of Constantinople, A. D. 381. The following is the original. The parts omitted at Constantinople are put in brackets in the Greek text, in the margin:

"We believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God begotten of the Father, Only-begotten, that is of the substance of the Father: God of God; Light of Light; very God of very God; begotten, not made; of the same substance with the Father; by whom all things were made, both things in heaven and things in earth; who for us men and our salvation descended and became flesh, was made man, suffered, and rose again the third day. He ascended into heaven; he cometh to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost. But those that say *there was a time when he was not*; or that he was not before he was begotten; or that he was made from that which had no being; or who affirm the Son of God to be of any other substance or essence, or *created*, or variable, or mutable, such persons doth the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematize."‡

* Irenæus: *Adversus Haereses*, i, 10. † Tertullianus: *De Virginitibus Velandis*, c. i.

‡ Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεόν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα, πάντων ὁρατῶν τε καὶ ἀόρατων ποιήτην· καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ, γεννηθέντα ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς [μονογενῆ, του-

It will be seen that this creed recognizes the Son as the same substance (*ὁμοούσιον*) with the Father. But this was soon disputed by the semi-Arians and Eusebians, who wished to substitute an "ι" for the "ο;" and hence a bitter controversy arose between the respective advocates of *ὁμοούσιον* and *ὁμοιούσιον*; those contending for the "ο" were declared orthodox, while those contending for the "ι" were declared heterodox. Thus, the difference between an "ι" and an "ο" made Arius a *heretic*, and Athanasius a *saint*. After several ineffectual attempts of different Synods to agree upon a formula by which this controversy could be brought to an end, the *Nicene Symbol*, with certain additions, was adopted at the second Ecumenical Council at Constantinople.

Symbolum Nicæno—Constantinopolitanum.

This symbol introduces scientific conceptions and technical terms, so as to preclude the possibility of two interpretations, as had been the fate of the earlier symbol. It gives a more elaborate and explanatory statement of the terms "essence," "substance," "hypostasis," and "personal subsistence," in order that there may be no equivocation or evasion in reference to the terms Father, Son, and Spirit. It is as follows, with the additions to the *Nicene Creed* in brackets:

"(1) I believe in one God the Father Almighty, Maker [of heaven and earth], and of all things visible and invisible; (2) And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of his Father [before all worlds]; (God of God), Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father; by whom all things were made; (3) Who for us men and for our salvation came down from heaven, and was incarnate [by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary], and was made man, [and was crucified also for us under Pontius Pilate]; he suffered and was buried; and the third day he rose again, according to the Scriptures; and ascended into heaven, [and sitteth on the right hand of the Father]. And he shall come again with glory to judge both the quick and the dead [whose kingdom shall have no end]. And I believe in the Holy Ghost [the Lord

τέστιν ἐκ τῆς οὐσίας τοῦ πατρὸς, Θεὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ], ὡς ἐκ φωτὸς, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινῷ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα, ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ, δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο [τά τε ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ γῇ], τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα καὶ σαρκωθέντα καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, παθόντα καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς, καὶ ἐρχόμενον κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς. Καὶ εἰς τὸ ἅγιον πνεῦμα. [Τοὺς δὲ λέγοντας, ὅτι ἦν ποτε ὅτε οὐκ ἦν, καὶ πρὶν γεννηθῆναι οὐκ ἦν, καὶ ὅτι ἐξ οὐκ ὄντων ἐγένετο, ἢ κτιστὸν ἐξ ἐτέρας ὑποστάσεως ἢ οὐσίας φάσκοντας εἶναι, ἢ τρεπτόν ἢ αλλοιωτὸν τὸν νῦν τοῦ Θεοῦ, ἀναθεματίζει ἡ ἁγία καθολικὴ καὶ ἀποστολικὴ ἐκκλησία.] (Athanasius, *Epist. de decret. Syn. Nic.*; Eus. *Cæs. Ep. ad Cesariens.*; Socrates, *Hist. Eccles.* i, 8.)

and Giver of Life, who proceedeth from the Father (and the Son), who with the Father and the Son together is worshiped and glorified, who spake by the prophets. And I believe one Catholic and Apostolic Church. I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins; and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and the life of the world to come. Amen.]"*

Ephesian and Chalcedon Symbols.

These were adopted—one at the Council at Ephesus, A. D. 431, and the other at the Council of Chalcedon, A. D. 451. The Ephesian Creed condemned the Nestorian theory of two distinct persons in Christ, and reaffirmed the theory of one person consisting of two natures; while the Chalcedon Creed condemned the Eutychian or Monophysite theory of but one nature in Christ, and reaffirmed the old theory of two natures in the unity of one person.

Symbolum Quicumque.

This is generally called the "Athanasian Creed," as it was, for a long time, supposed that Athanasius was its author. It is, however, now quite certain that he was not. The *δμοούσιον* of the *Nicene Symbol* is omitted, while it contains the results of the Ephesian and Chalcedonian Councils respecting the person of Christ—two facts which go far to prove that Athanasius was not its author. Dr. Shedd supposes it to have originated in the Western Church, and in the school of Augustine and Hilary, whose Trinitarianism it embodies.† As its doctrines are substantially given in the symbols already noticed, it is unnecessary to do more than make this reference to it. And with this we have reached the end of the important symbols antedating the Lutheran Reformation.

* Πιστεύομεν εἰς ἕνα Θεόν, πατέρα παντοκράτορα [ποιητὴν οὐρανοῦ καὶ γῆς], ὁρατῶν τε πάντων καὶ ἀοράτων· καὶ εἰς ἕνα κύριον Ἰησοῦν Χριστὸν, τὸν υἱὸν τοῦ Θεοῦ [τὸν μονογενῆ], τὸν ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς γεννηθέντα [πρὸ πάντων τῶν αἰώνων], ὡς ἐκ φωτός, Θεὸν ἀληθινὸν ἐκ Θεοῦ ἀληθινοῦ, γεννηθέντα οὐ ποιηθέντα ὁμοούσιον τῷ πατρὶ δι' οὗ τὰ πάντα ἐγένετο. Τὸν δι' ἡμᾶς τοὺς ἀνθρώπους καὶ διὰ τὴν ἡμετέραν σωτηρίαν κατελθόντα [ἐκ τῶν οὐρανῶν] καὶ σαρκωθέντα [ἐκ πνεύματος ἁγίου καὶ Μαρίας τῆς παρθένου], καὶ ἐνανθρωπήσαντα, [σταυρωθέντα τε ὑπὲρ ἡμῶν ἐπὶ Ποντίου Πιλάτου], καὶ παθόντα [καὶ ταφέντα] καὶ ἀναστάντα τῇ τρίτῃ ἡμέρᾳ [κατὰ τὰς γραφάς] καὶ ἀνελθόντα εἰς τοὺς οὐρανοὺς [καὶ καθεζόμενον ἐκ δεξιῶν τοῦ πατρὸς], καὶ πάλιν ἐρχόμενον [μετὰ δόξης] κρῖναι ζῶντας καὶ νεκρούς [οὗ τῆς βασιλείας οὐκ ἔσται τέλος]. Καὶ εἰς πνεῦμα τὸ ἅγιον [τὸ κύριον, τὸ ζωοποιόν, τὸ ἐκ τοῦ πατρὸς ἐκπορευόμενον, τὸ σὺν πατρὶ καὶ υἱῷ συμπροσκυνούμενον, καὶ συνδoxαζόμενον, τὸ λαλῆσαν διὰ τῶν προφητῶν. Εἰς μίαν ἁγίαν καθολικὴν καὶ ἀποστολικὴν ἐκκλησίαν· ὁμολογοῦμεν ἕν βάπτισμα εἰς ἄφεσιν ἁμαρτιῶν· προσδοκῶμεν ἀνάστασιν νεκρῶν καὶ ζωὴν τοῦ μέλλοντος αἰῶνος]. Ἀμήν.

† Christian Doctrine, vol. ii, p. 440.

RECAPITULATION.

In looking over the ancient and mediæval symbols, we at once discover that the Patristic mind was chiefly occupied with the doctrines of Theology and Christology. The conflicts of the ancient Church were well calculated to develop this peculiarity in its symbolism. The influence of Judaism, the philosophies of Plato and Aristotle, the Ebionite, Gnostic, and Pagan skepticisms; the Arian, Nominal Trinitarian, Monarchian or Patripacian, Nestorian, Eutychian or Monophysite heresies in Christology, were the generating influences of the human creeds antedating the period of the Reformation. Very little is said in these creeds concerning the doctrines of Anthropology, Soteriology, and Eschatology. The controversy between Augustine and Pelagius, though it furnished the foundation for all subsequent theological science on the questions discussed, did not result in the announcement of any distinct and definite symbol. "Hence," (to use the language of Dr. Shedd), "there was no barrier of a *theoretical* kind, to the entrance of the Pelagian theory of sin, and the legalistic theory of justification, which are characteristic of the Papal as distinguished from the Primitive and Patristic Churches."* While there was very earnest, and often heated, discussion upon other matters, the doctrine of the Trinity was the central idea of the ancient creeds, and was, consequently, the chief thing to be considered in determining the question of fellowship.

We think it can not be denied by any one, who will make a careful survey of that period of the history of the Church to which the symbols we have noticed belong, that the doctrinal statements of the Church were not altogether unnecessary. We are inclined to think that the chief mistake made was, not so much in formulating these statements, as in making them bonds of union and communion. It was, doubtless, expedient that the Church should try to hedge itself against the numerous errors to which it was constantly exposed by coming in contact with the various forms of philosophy; skepticism, and worldly influences which prevailed to such an alarming extent prior to the Lutheran Reformation. Lamè legs are better than no legs at all. And it was far better for the Church to hold to some distinct and definite doctrines, though these should be largely human,

* Christian Doctrine, vol. ii, p. 442.

than to go into irretrievable anarchy. Hence, while we do not apologize for human symbols, we are free to say that, after the Church had once departed from the Primitive faith, it was doubtless better to pursue the course it did, in formulating its faith, than to plunge into the certain ruin which awaited it in a less definite and decided course. Human Creeds, then, become the monuments that mark the battle-grounds of the Church, while it has been wandering in the wilderness. These symbols tell us of the struggles of human souls, away from the pure Fountain of their life, yet holding sweet and blessed memories of the "days that are no more."

MODERN SYMBOLS.*

The period of the Reformation was prolific in its symbolic literature. As the conflicts of the Patristic Church with Judaism and Paganism generated its Creedism, so did the conflicts of Luther and his associates with the Roman Hierarchy develop the Creedism of the Reformation. The Confessions of Faith of this period are so numerous that we can do little more than give a passing notice of the more important ones. And first, in point of time as well as importance, is the

AUGSBURG CONFESSION.—This was first adopted at the Diet at Augsburg, in 1530. It is divided into two parts; the one, positive and didactic in its contents; the other, negative and polemic. The first division is composed of twenty-one articles, and enunciates the doctrines of Scripture as understood and confessed by the Lutherans. The second division is composed of seven articles, and is directed against the errors of Romanism.

An analysis of this Confession will serve to show the advance which it makes in several directions, when compared with the Patristic symbols.

Theology.—This is the same as the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan Trinitarianism.

Christology.—It affirms the doctrine of the Chalcedon Symbol on this subject.

Anthropology.—It adopts the Augustinian theory, as the following extracts will show:

*For a convenient and able summary of modern symbols, see Shedd's *Christian Doctrine*, vol. ii.

"The Churches teach that after the fall of Adam, all men propagated according to ordinary generation are born with sin, that is, without the fear of God, without trust in God, and with concupiscence, and that this disease (*morbis*) or original vitiosity is truly sin, damning, and bringing eternal death upon those who are not regenerated by baptism and the Holy Spirit. The Churches also condemn the Pelagians and others who deny this original vitiosity (*vitium originis*) to be sin." *

And it further says :

"The Churches teach that the human will has some liberty, sufficient for attaining morality and choosing things that appear reasonable (*ad efficiendam civilem justitiam et diligendas res rationi subjectas*). But it has not the power, without the Spirit of God, of attaining holiness or spiritual excellence (*efficiendæ justitiæ dei, seu justitiæ spiritualis*), because the carnal man does not perceive those things that are spiritual. (1 Cor. ii, 14)." †

Soteriology.—The following extracts will give the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession on this subject. It will be seen that it does not differ materially from the doctrine of the orthodox Creeds of the present day :

"The Churches teach that men can not be justified before God by their own power, merit, or works, but are justified on account of Christ, through faith, when they believe that they are received into favor, and their sins are remitted, for Christ's sake, who made satisfaction for our sins by his death. This faith God imputes for righteousness before him. (Rom. iii and iv.)" ‡

"Our good works can not reconcile God, or merit remission of sins, grace, and justification, but we obtain all these by faith *alone*; by believing that we are received into favor for the sake of Christ, who *alone* is the mediator and propitiation by which the Father is reconciled. This doctrine respecting faith is every-where taught by Paul—'By grace are ye saved through faith, and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God. Not of works,' etc. Our Churches also teach that it is necessary to perform good works, not, however, in order to merit pardon and remission of sins, but because God wills and commands them." ||

Eschatology.—This is the same as the Catholic doctrine, as the following extract will show :

"The Churches condemn the Anabaptists, who are of opinion that there will be an end to the punishment of lost men and devils. They likewise condemn are those who disseminating Jewish opinions, that prior to the resurrection of the dead the saints are to possess the kingdoms of the world, the wicked being ever-where overcome (*oppressis*)." §

Papal Germs.—Notwithstanding this Confession was aimed directly at the Roman Church, Articles X, XII, and XIII show conclusively

* Hase : Libri Symbolici, 9, 10.

† Hase : Libri Symbolici, 10.

‡ Hase : Libri Symbolici, 14.

† Hase : Libri Symbolici, 1.

|| Hase : Libri Symbolici, 17, 18.

that the Lutherans were not entirely out of the smoke of Babylon. Although it is distinctly denied that the sacraments are efficacious, *ex opere operato*, it is, nevertheless, affirmed that "the body and blood of Christ are truly present and are distributed to those who partake of the Supper."*

Article XII treats of the doctrine of absolution, and very closely resembles the Papal view on that subject.

CONFESSIO VARIATA.—In 1540, ten years after the adoption of the Augsburg Confession, Melancthon published an edition in Latin, which goes under the name of the "*Variata*," the original edition being denominated the "*Invariata*." Melancthon's changes relate to the subjects of regeneration and the sacraments. We have already seen that the original Confession, in its Anthropology, was decidedly Monergistic, but, at this time, Melancthon was more inclined to Synergism, and hence the altered edition leans to the theory of co-operation in regeneration. The *Confessio Variata* leans also to the Calvinistic theory of the sacraments, showing a decided reaction against the semi-Popish theory of consubstantiation.

A number of Lutheran Confessions followed these ; but as they all contain, in substance, the doctrines of the Augsburg Confession and the Apology, we do not deem it necessary to notice them here.

REFORMED CONFESSIONS.—Had we space, we would like to make an extended notice of these, but as they are so numerous, we must be content with a brief reference to one or two of the most important. They all differed from the Lutheran mainly in the doctrines of Anthropology and Soteriology. Zwingle's "*Fidei Ratio*" differed from the *Augsburg Confession* upon the subjects of original sin and the sacrament of the Supper. And though it was the work of an individual mind, and never adopted by any secular or ecclesiastical body, it nevertheless exerted a great influence in forming the symbolism of the Reformed Churches. But the most important of all the Reformed Confessions constructed prior to the appearance of Calvin is the "*Confessio Helvetica Prior*," sometimes called the second Basle Confession. It had its origin in an effort of the Reformed Theologians of Switzerland to effect a union with the Lutherans of Germany. It was subscribed by the proper authorities, March 26, 1536, and was adopted by all the Reformed Cantons of Switzerland

*Hase : Libri Symbolici, 12.

as their symbol. The next year it was sent to the Lutheran Theologians at Wurtemberg, and at Smalcald, but failed to accomplish its purpose.

As this Confession was intended to be a peace-offering to the Lutherans, we are not surprised to find it going back very considerably toward the *Augsburg Confession* on the subject of original sin. It agrees with that Confession in recognizing the Adamic Connection. It differs from it in asserting, by implication, instead of directly, that original sin is guilt, and agrees with it in denying a recuperative power in the fallen will—a point upon which Zwingle's *Fidei Ratio* is silent, neither affirming nor denying.*

The doctrine of the Lord's-Supper is stated as follows :

"In the mystic Supper, the Lord offers his body and blood, that is, himself, to those that are truly his, that they may live more and more in him and he in them. Not that the bread and wine are, in their own substance, united with the substance of the body and blood of the Lord ; but the bread and wine, by the institution of our Lord, are symbols through which is exhibited a true communication by the Lord himself, through the ministers of the Church, of his own body and blood, not as the perishing food of the flesh, but as the nourishment of eternal life."†

So far, the influence of Calvin had not been felt in the composition of the Reformed Confessions. But Calvin himself drew up, in 1549, the "*Consensus Tigurinus*," which was adopted by the Zurich theologians. It comprises twenty-six articles, and treats only of the sacrament of the Supper. This was followed, in 1551, by Calvin's "*Consensus Genevensis*," which is confined to a full exhibition of his theory of predestination. This was adopted by the Genevan theologians, and soon acquired almost universal authority among the Reformed Churches of Switzerland. This prepared the way for the "*Confessio Helvetica Posterior*," or the second Helvetic Confession, which was constructed by Bullinger, in 1564, and was adopted by all the Reformed Churches in Switzerland, with the exception of Basle, and by the Reformed Churches in Scotland, Hungary, Poland, and France. This creed embodies the theology of that division of Protestantism which received its first formation by Zwingle, Calvin, and their coadjutors. As it is one of the most important Confessions since the days of Luther, we give its principal doctrines :

Doctrine of the Trinity.—"We believe that God, one and indivisible in essence, is, without division or confusion, distinct in three persons : Father, Son, and Holy

* See Shedd's *Christian Doctrine*, vol. ii, p. 467.

† Niemeyer : *Collectio*, 120, *sq.*

Spirit, so that the Father generates the Son from eternity, the Son is begotten by an ineffable generation, but the Holy Spirit proceeds from each, and that from eternity, and is to be adored together with each, so that there are not three Gods, but three persons consubstantial, co-eternal, and co-equal, distinct as hypostases, and one having precedence of another as to order, but with no inequality as to essence."*

Doctrine of Predestination and Election.—"God, from eternity, predestinated or elected, freely and of his own mere grace, with no respect of men's character, the saints whom he would save in Christ, according to that saying of the Apostle: 'God chose us in himself before the foundation of the world.' Not without a medium, though not on account of any merit of ours. In Christ, and on account of Christ, God elected us, so that they who are ingrafted in Christ by faith, are the elect, but those out of Christ are the reprobate."†

Doctrine of Sin.—"Sin we understand to be that native corruption of man derived or propagated to us all from our first parents, by which, immersed in evil concupiscence and adverse from good, but prone to all evil, full of all wickedness, unbelief, contempt, and hatred of God, we are unable to do or even to think any good of ourselves."‡

Doctrine of the Will.—"In the unrenewed man there is no free-will to do good, no power for performing good."||

Doctrine of Justification.—Justification, in the meaning of the Apostle, signifies remission of sins, absolution from guilt and punishment, reception into favor, and pronouncing just—"all because Christ took the sins of the world upon himself, endured their punishment, and satisfied Divine justice."§

Doctrine of the Eucharist.—"He who instituted the Supper, and commanded us to eat bread and drink wine, willed that believers should not perceive the bread and wine only, without any sense of the mystery (*Sine mysterio*), as they eat bread at home, but they should partake spiritually of the things signified, *i. e.*, be washed from their sins through faith in Christ's blood and sacrifice."¶

As this symbol did not settle the controversies which had sprung up in the various branches of Protestantism, it was soon followed by others, which only served to widen the breach between the extreme parties, and to furnish additional evidence that Christian unity is simply an impossible thing on a human basis. "*The Canons of the Synod of Dort*" were especially aimed at the Arminians, while the thirty-nine *Articles* of the English Church were intended to split the difference between the Lutheran and Calvinistic theories of the sacraments, and establish the polity of prelatial episcopacy. The "*Westminster Confession*" is very much the same as the *Canons* of the Synod of Dort, while the "*Savoy Confession*," adopted by the Puritan Independents in England, differs from the Westminster Confession mainly as to the polity and discipline of the Churches.

* Niemeyer: *Collectio*, 470, 471.

† *Ibid.*, 481.

‡ *Ibid.*, 477.

|| *Ibid.*, 480.

§ *Ibid.*, 494.

¶ *Ibid.*, 514, 515.

Of the American symbols, the oldest and most important is the "*Cambridge Platform*," but it is wholly confined to Church polity and refers to the Westminster symbol for a dogmatic statement. "*The Boston Confession*" was adopted in 1679. This reaffirms, in the Preface, the Calvinism of the Westminster and Savoy Confessions, then adopts substantially the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan Trinitarianism. Its Anthropology agrees with the Latin in distinction from the Greek, maintaining, first, that original sin, equally with actual, is guilty transgression of law, and deserves the punishment of eternal death; and second, that the will of man since the Fall does not possess the power to do good which it had by creation, and before the Apostasy. Its Soteriology is the doctrine of substitution, and agrees generally with the Protestant Confessions of the Old World.

We close this hasty sketch of modern symbols with the "*Creed of Pope Pius IV*," which is a summary of the doctrines of the Roman Church, as contained in the canons and decrees of the Council of Trent. It was issued, in the form of a Bull, in December, 1564, by Pope Pius IV. All bishops, ecclesiastics, and teachers in the Romish Church, as well as all converts from Protestantism, are required to publicly profess assent to it. We omit the first part, as it is the same as the Nicene Creed, slightly altered:

"I most firmly admit and embrace apostolical and ecclesiastical traditions, and all other constitutions and observances of the same Church. I also admit the Sacred Scriptures according to the sense which the holy mother Church has held and does hold, to whom it belongs to judge of the true sense and interpretation of the Holy Scriptures; nor will I ever take or interpret them otherwise than according to the unanimous consent of the fathers. I profess, also, that there are truly and properly seven sacraments of the new law, instituted by Jesus Christ our Lord, and for the salvation of mankind, though all are not necessary for every one—namely, baptism, confirmation, eucharist, penance, extreme unction, orders, and matrimony, and that they confer grace; and of these, baptism, confirmation, and order can not be reiterated without sacrilege. I do also receive and admit the ceremonies of the Catholic Church, received and approved in the solemn administration of all the above-said sacraments. I receive and embrace all and every one of the things which have been defined and declared in the holy Council of Trent concerning sin and justification. I profess likewise that in the mass is offered to God a true, proper, and propitiatory sacrifice for the living and the dead; and that in the most holy sacrament of the eucharist there is truly, really, and substantially the body and blood, together with the soul and divinity, of our Lord Jesus Christ; and that there is made a conversion of the whole substance of the bread into the body, and of the whole substance of the wine into the blood, which conversion the

Catholic Church calls transubstantiation. I confess, also, that under either kind alone, whole and entire, Christ and a true sacrament is received. I constantly hold that there is a purgatory, and that the souls detained therein are helped by the suffrages of the faithful. Likewise that the saints reigning together with Christ are to be honored and invocated, and that they offer prayers to God for us, and that their relics are to be venerated. I most firmly assert that the images of Christ, and of the mother of God ever Virgin, and also of the other saints, are to be had and retained, and that due honor and veneration are to be given to them. I also affirm that the power of indulgences was left by Christ in the Church, and that the use of them is most wholesome to Christian people. I acknowledge the holy catholic and apostolic Roman Church, the mother and mistress of all Churches; and I promise and swear true obedience to the Roman bishop, the successor of St. Peter, prince of the apostles and vicar of Jesus Christ. I also profess and undoubtedly receive all other things delivered, defined, and declared by the sacred canons and general councils, and particularly by the holy Council of Trent; and likewise I also condemn, reject, and anathematize all things contrary thereto, and all heresies whatsoever condemned, rejected, and anathematized by the Church. This true catholic faith, out of which none can be saved, which I now freely profess and truly hold, I, A. B., promise, vow, and swear most constantly to hold, and profess the same whole and entire, with God's assistance, to the end of my life; and to procure, as far as lies in my power, that the same shall be held, taught, and preached by all who are under me, or are intrusted to my care, by virtue of my office. So help me God, and these holy Gospels of God. Amen."*

GENERAL RECAPITULATORY SURVEY.

In looking over the symbolic literature of the Church, one of the most prominent facts brought to view is, that human creeds have utterly failed to bring peace to, or restore harmony among, the followers of Christ. It is a mistaken notion, we think, that these creeds were the primary cause of the divisions which have disgraced the history of the Church. We are inclined to think rather that the *cause* of these divisions was in the apostasy of the early Christians from the faith and practice of the apostles, and that the creeds which followed were but the results of the struggling Apostate Church to find again the lost purity of the faith. The apostasy was a gradual development. Although it had "begun to work" in the time of the apostles, it did not become fully established until the sixth century. During this period, Platonism, in its various forms, was chiefly the corrupting influence on the dogmatic or subjective development of the Church, while the formalities of Judaism, and the licentiousness of Paganism, largely gave shape to its objective life, and gradually led it away from the purity and simplicity of its

* The original may be found in Richter, *Canones et Decreta Concil. Trident.*, p. 574.

primitive practice. But as it is our purpose to follow the dogmatics of the Church, rather than its spiritual decay, we will now state a few things which we think are clearly evolved from the history of creeds.

I. *All human creeds either add to or subtract from the Divine creed; but, generally, they are distinguished for the addition of foreign matter.*

If we examine closely the "*Symbolum Apostolicum*," which is the oldest of all the human creeds, we shall discover that even it is not free from this charge. Passing over its evident attenuation of the theology and christology of the Divine creed, we call attention to where it introduces "the Holy Ghost; the Holy Catholic Church; the Communion of Saints; the Forgiveness of Sins; the Resurrection of the Body; and the Life Everlasting," as objects of faith. Now, it is simply a fact that none of these are made objects of faith in the Divine Creed; and in all the New Testament Scriptures no one is required to believe in them, *as such*, in order to salvation. That these are Scriptural subjects we do not deny. Yea, we insist upon a proper understanding of them, as quite important. But what we object to is, that they should be incorporated as a part of the Christian's Creed.

But it was reserved for the modern period of the Church to furnish abundant evidence of the fact to which we have called attention. While the Patristic Symbols are very objectionable on account of their philosophical subtleties they are not so stuffed with foreign matter as the Protestant Confessions of Faith. The Augsburg Confession introduces at least six distinct points that are not contained in the original New Testament creed. Where, in the New Testament, was it ever required of any one, as a condition of entrance into the kingdom, to believe in a certain doctrine of the fall of Adam; the nature of sin; its influence upon the will; vicarious atonement; punishment of the wicked; the resurrection of the dead saints to possess the kingdoms of the world; or any other doctrine except that contained in the proposition that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the Living God? But these additions were not enough. The *Helvetic Confessions*; the *Canons of the Synod of Dort*, and the *Westminster Confession* added the doctrines of Predestination and Election, and several other distracting elements. Surely it is not necessary to go further for proof that human creeds have made faith, which, of itself, is simple enough, a very perplexing thing.

It is not our purpose at present to discuss the causes which generated these additions. Doubtless the various opposing elements required some counter-statements from those who were endeavoring to reform the abuses of the Christian religion. But the cardinal mistake was to make these formulas the *tests* of Church-fellowship. Had they been regarded as only summaries of the teaching of the Scriptures upon the subjects in controversy, instead of Confessions of Faith, their influence might have been very different. But as a result of their authoritative character, behold the present divided state of Protestantism.

II. *Human creeds have introduced a terminology wholly incompatible with the simplicity of the Primitive Faith.*

This tendency began to show itself, in a very marked degree, in the Nicene creed, and is still farther developed in the Nicæno-Constantinopolitan and Athanasian Symbols of the Patristic Church; and at last finds its full development in the creeds of modern times. While it was evidently the purpose of the Councils of Nice and Constantinople to shut out the Arians, Socinians, Sabellians, etc., by such terms as "Essence," "Substance," "Nature," "Being," "Hypostases," "Person," "Generation," "Procession," "Mission," etc., these terms have been prolific sources of discord and division ever since the adoption of the Symbols that first contained them. But the objectionable features of this stilted terminology will be made still more apparent by considering the following phrases: "The Holy Trinity;" "Three persons of one substance, power, and eternity;" "Co-essential, con-substantial, co-equal;" "The Son eternally begotten of the Father;" "An eternal Son;" "Humanity and divinity of Christ;" "The Holy Ghost eternally proceeding from the Father and the Son;" "God's eternal decrees;" "Conditional and unconditional election and reprobation;" "God out of Christ;" "Free-will;" "Liberty and necessity;" "Original sin;" "Total depravity;" "Covenant of grace;" "Effectual calling;" "Free grace;" "Sovereign grace;" "General and particular atonement;" "Satisfy divine justice;" "Common and special operations of the Holy Ghost;" "Imputed righteousness;" "Inherent righteousness;" "Progressive sanctification;" "Justifying and saving faith;" "Legal repentance;" "Evangelical repentance;" "Perseverance of the Saints;" and "Falling from grace;" "Visible and invisible Church;" "Infant membership;" "Sacraments;"

"Eucharist;" "Con-substantiation;" "Church government;" "The power of the keys;" etc.*

III. *Human Creeds have not only added foreign matter to the original creed and introduced a stilted terminology, but have also substituted, as the object of faith, doctrines concerning Christ for Christ himself.*

This is, after all, the chief objection to human symbols as bonds of religious union and communion. It was not enough to require men to believe in that which no inspired teacher ever commanded, but they must have their minds turned away from the light and life of Christianity to the cold abstract, metaphysical deductions of human reason. The dissensions which have rent the religious world have not been in reference to the *fact* that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God, but in reference to philosophical questions concerning his human nature and divine nature; whether his divine nature *suffered* at the crucifixion; *how* he is the Son of God; whether he was *one* person or *two*; and *for what reason* his sacrifice was *necessary* in order to the salvation of the world.† These and kindred matters have occupied the time of some of the most important councils that ever assembled, whose decisions have filled the religious world with endless controversies about "οὐσία," "φύσις;" "ὑπόστασις," "ἰδιότης," "γέννησις," "ἐκπόρευσις," "ἐκπεμφίς," *et id omne genus*.

The creeds have all failed to perceive that the faith of the Gospel

* Christian System, pp., 129, 30.

† "John Damascus endeavored to reconcile the doctrine of two natures and two wills, with the unity of person, by regarding the Divine nature as that which constitutes the person, and by illustrating the mutual relation in which the two natures stand to each other, through the use of the phrases τρόπος ἀντιθέσεως and περιχώρησις. The Greek theologians in general adopted his views. The orthodox doctrine was again endangered by the Adoption interpretation of the Sonship of Christ, advanced by several Spanish bishops, especially Elipandus of Toledo, and Felix of Urgella, whom Alcuin and others successfully combated. The Adoption theory, by making a distinction between an adopted son and a natural one, leaned toward Nestorianism, though its peculiar modifications admitted a milder interpretation. Peter Lombard's view, that the Son of God did *not become any thing* by the assumption of human nature, (because no change can take place in the Divine nature,) was branded as the heresy of Nihilianism, though he advanced it without any evil intention, and was falsely interpreted as if he meant that Christ had become *nothing*. Albert the Great, and Thomas Aquinas, endeavored to develop the Christological doctrines of the Church in a dialectic method. But along side of this dialectic scholasticism, there was constantly found, as its supplement, a mystical and moral tendency of a practical character. Some of this class despised all the subtle reasonings of the schools, while others, partly adopting them, regarded Christ, as it were, as the Divine representative, or the restored prototype, of humanity. On the contrary, the false mystics transformed the historical Christ into a mere ideal."—Hagenbach's *History of Doctrines*, vol. ii, pp. 35, 36.

is not belief in some *particular representation of Jesus*, some definite formula which expresses a *philosophical conception* of him, but belief in *Jesus himself*—in him who was dead, but is alive for evermore. This the scholasticism of the Mediæval Church would not permit, but insisted upon a scientific formula, which, whether true or false, ought now to be rejected by every intelligent Christian, not because it is true or false, but because it is a *theory*, and *as such*, is a perversion of "*the faith once delivered to the saints.*"*

The modern Church has not given as much attention to the speculations concerning Christ as the Mediæval Church did, but it has

*Archbishop Whateley uses the following appropriate language in his "*Rise, Progress, and Corruptions of Christianity.*" His words are worthy to be written in letters of gold:

"The proper objection to the various philosophical systems of religion—the different hypotheses or theories that have been introduced to *explain* the Christian dispensation—is not the real difficulties that have been urged (often with good reason) against *each* separately; but the fault that belongs to *all* of them equally. It is not that the Arian theory of the Incarnation, for instance, is wrong for *this* reason, and the Nestorian for *that*, and the Eutychian for *another*, and so on; but they are *all* wrong alike, because they are theories, relative to matters on which it is vain, and absurd, and irreverent to attempt forming any philosophical theories whatever.

"And the same, we think, may be said of the various schemes (devised either by those Divines called the Schoolmen, or by others) on which it has been attempted, from time to time, to explain other religious mysteries also in the Divine nature and dispensation. We would object, for instance, to the Pelagian theory, and to the Calvinistic theory, and the Arminian theory, and others, not for reasons *peculiar* to each one, but for such as apply in *common* to *all*.

"Philosophical divines are continually prone to forget that the subjects on which they speculate are, *confessedly*, and by their *own* account, beyond the reach of the human faculties. This is no reason, indeed, against our believing any thing clearly *revealed in Scripture*, but it *is* a reason against going beyond Scripture with metaphysical speculations of our own.

"One of the many evils resulting from this is, that they thus lay open Christianity to infidel objections, such as it would otherwise have been safe from. It is too late, when objections are alleged from the difficulties involved in some theory, to reply, that the whole subject is mysterious and above reason, and can not be satisfactorily explained to our imperfect faculties. The objector may answer, Then you should have *left* it in the original mysterious indistinctness of the Scriptures. *Your own explanations* of the doctrines of your Scriptures, you must not be suffered to make use of as far as they are admitted from attack; and then, when they are opposed, to shelter them from attack, as sacred mysteries. If we enter on the field of philosophical argument, we can not be allowed afterward to shrink back from fair discussion on philosophical principles.

"It is wiser and safer, as well as more pious and humble, and more agreeable to Christian truth, to confess that of the mysteries which have been so boldly discussed by many who *acknowledged them to be unfathomable*, we know nothing beyond the faint and indistinct revelations of Scripture; and that if it had been possible, and proper, and designed, that we should know *more* of such matters, more would have been *there* revealed.

"And we should rather point out to objectors that what *is* revealed, is *practical*, and not speculative; that what the Scriptures are concerned with is, not the philosophy of the human mind in itself, nor yet the philosophy of the Divine nature in itself, but (that which is properly religion) the *relation* and connection of the two Beings—what God is *to us*, what he has done and will *do* for us, and what *we* are to be and to do in regard to him."

not been by any means indifferent to philosophical questions. What the theologians at Nicæ, Constantinople, Ephesus, and Chalcedon regarded as the vital questions in Theology and Christology our modern divines have been disposed to consider of secondary importance, while they have given the first place to the subjects of Anthropology, Soteriology, and Eschatology. These subjects have furnished the weapons for modern theological pugilism, and, as a consequence, our symbolical literature is full of abstract statements concerning original sin ; the doctrine of satisfaction ; the resurrection and final state of man. What the modern Church needs to understand is not that the Calvinistic Anthropology is superior to the Arminian, or the Arminian Soteriology superior to the Calvinistic, but that these are questions which belong to the schools, not to the Church, and must not, therefore, be allowed to enter into the question of any one's faith. These are matters concerning which it is all-important to have correct views ; but they do not properly belong to the question of the Churches' creed, and hence should not be made barriers in the way of Christian union and communion. And until theologians shall abandon their fruitless discussions about things which do not properly belong to the Christian faith, it is impossible to hope for "the unity of the spirit in the bond of peace."

THE REAL QUESTION.

In the foregoing historical review we have seen that human creeds, at best, have been only the lame-legs on which the Church hobbled down into the Apostasy, and on which it has struggled to get back again to its primitive state. We have seen, also, that soon after the Reformation was begun, creed-making became almost a mania—for the reason, we suppose, that theologians thought that a large number of *lame-legs* might be equal to one that was *sound*. But the present divided state of Christendom is not very encouraging to those who imagine that this multiplication of creeds would be equal to the restoration of the primitive order of things. It is, however, an evil wind that blows no good ; and we have a striking illustration of this in the matter before us. For, in the exact ratio in which human creeds have *multiplied*, they have ceased to be *authoritative* ; and hence have already largely lost their power over the minds and hearts of the people. This is a hopeful sign, and at once suggests

the real question which we have been seeking to reach in this paper, namely: *Is it possible for the Church to exist, and to be, in all respects, what Christ designed it should be, without a human symbol scientifically formulating its faith?*

In answering this question, it is only necessary to again call attention to the Primitive Church. We saw, in our notice of the apostolic preaching, that these inspired proclaimers of the Gospel used no confession of faith except the one authorized by the Savior himself, and on which he said he would build his Church. Now, we must conclude that either the Primitive Church was defective in this respect, or else the Divine Creed is all that was necessary then as a symbol of faith. In answer to this, some may say that *Tempora mutantur nos et mutamur in illis*—times change and creeds with them. But by what authority has any uninspired man the right to change the most vital thing in the religion of Christ? Surely if we have the right to corrupt the fountain of Christianity, no one ought to complain because the stream is impure. It is, however, we apprehend, a mistaken notion that the times require any change in the creed of the Church from what it was in the days of the apostles. We need the same simple faith now that was needed then. For, whatever of progress may be claimed for religion in modern times, it should never be forgotten that this progress is from an Apostate Church toward the Primitive Church. In looking at the present state of the Christian religion, we are too apt to consider it as a normal development from the Primitive Church. But this is very far from the truth. The Christianity of to-day is *historically* a development from the Mediæval Church—a Church which was different in almost every respect from the one established by Christ and his apostles. The times evidently require a religion different from that which prevailed in the Middle Ages, but we think it is not at all incompatible with the idea of true progress to say that we will find that religion only as we approach the apostolic faith and practice. Hence, even if any one had the *right* to change the creed, it is by no means certain that a change would be beneficial. Of one thing at least we are persuaded, that the prayer of the Savior for unity among his followers will never be answered while the bounds of Christian fraternity are measured by the dimensions of human creeds. •

But it may be said that there are other *essential things* in Christian-

ity besides its creed, concerning which men will differ. Consequently, though all should agree to accept the Divine Creed, there are still other things that must be settled before we can "all speak the same thing" and "be perfectly joined together in the same mind and the same judgment." Doubtless this is true, but how is the difficulty to be solved? Surely not by adding another to it. But, if we can once get rid of the creed question *proper*, we are inclined to think there will not be much trouble about the "other essential things" which must be understood.

We are now prepared to call attention again to the purpose of the New Testament. We must not forget that the different parts of this must be considered with reference to their respective specific designs; for, in no other way can it be infallibly understood. When, however, it is studied in harmony with its purpose, it will be found to provide for at least three things:

I. Faith: embracing all that relates to the creed.

II. Obedience: embracing all the commands of Christ.

III. Experience: embracing all that belongs to the practice of the Christian life.

The first of these rests upon evidence; the second, upon authority; and the third, upon relationship. We believe in Jesus, because we are convinced that he is the Christ; we obey his commands, because, being the Christ, he has all authority; we suffer with him, because, as our Elder Brother, we love him, and hope to be also "glorified together," for "we reckon that the sufferings of this present time are not worthy to be compared with the glory that shall be revealed in us."

Now, concerning Faith, there is no ground for division, except into *belief* and *unbelief*, and in harmony with this classification the New Testament properly divides all men into "believers" and "unbelievers." Hence, it will readily appear to any reflecting mind that any difference in reference to faith, as such, is an abnormal difference, and for which there is no provision made in the Divine record. On the contrary, all such differences are earnestly condemned. And if this view of the matter be correct, and we do not think it can be seriously questioned, then it follows, with irresistible force, that all departures from the original Confession of Faith must necessarily begin an apostasy, or, at best, an abnormal Christianity. Hence, we

conclude that there must be but *one creed*, since there is "one faith," and that all other creeds are human inventions, and should at once be abandoned by all who are seeking to reach the Divine standard in the Christian Religion.*

But may we not differ concerning the commands of Christ? And if so, will it not be necessary to formulate these differences? We answer, first, there are no justifiable grounds for differences concerning any thing that Christ has positively commanded; and, second, though the contrary were true, we would still contend that these differences need not be made tests of fellowship; for, if Christ has left any of his commandments in such doubtful language, as that men may rightfully understand them differently, then it seems to be self-evident that every one should be allowed to freely entertain his own opinion concerning these; for, surely, if Christ did use doubtful language in giving any of his commandments, he did not intend these commandments to be tests of fellowship, since he and his apostles every-where exhort the disciples to be one.

But we can not conceive of commands that can not be understood, and we do not believe that the Savior's commands are exceptions to the rule. We believe that it is just as possible to have unity in reference to the commands of Christ as in reference to the Divine Creed. True, if we speculate concerning the philosophy of the commands, differences will at once begin to appear. But this is equally true of the Creed, or of that which is addressed to our faith. But if we confine ourselves to what is commanded, and agree to obey simply because Christ, whom we have accepted in the Creed as Divine, has all authority to prescribe the conditions of our salvation, there can and will be no room for any important differences in reference to the subject of obedience. When we have the proper faith, our language will be, "Speak, Lord, thy servant heareth."

To illustrate what we mean, we will take baptism as an example.

*It has been said that there must of necessity be more than one creed, for the reason that the differences in the minds and circumstances of men will compel them to diversity in their religious belief. But these differences can find expression in other things than the faith. This must be so, or there can be no "unity of the faith," and hence the purpose of Christianity has failed. Equally fallacious is the argument founded on the assumption that men will have different creeds, though these creeds may not be written. What men *will* have, is one thing, and what they *ought* to have, is quite another. We do not care whether the creed of every man is written or unwritten, if it is the Divine Creed. It is the right thing we are after, not how it is expressed.

That this is a command of Christ no one will dispute; but precisely *what it is* has been much in controversy. Now, suppose that some one who holds that sprinkling or pouring is baptism should present himself to a Church for membership which practices only immersion, what disposition will the Church make of his case? The man says he believes in Christ, has been sprinkled, and has a good religious character, but is not willing to be immersed.

Now, if baptism is a command, concerning the action of which there may be reasonable doubt, then we hold it is the duty of the Church to accept the applicant upon the baptism he claims for himself; for if there is ground here for reasonable doubt, there surely is none to debar fellowship. But if we can infallibly know what Christ did command, when he instituted baptism, then if sprinkling is *not* that thing, and immersion *is*, it is simply certain the Church should require that the applicant shall be immersed.

"But," says one, "this is a question of *interpretation*, and, as such, who shall decide where a difference arises? In the case referred to, the man had as much right to say what baptism is as the Church had, and if he was satisfied, the Church ought to have been satisfied also." We deny, however, that baptism is a question of interpretation, except so far as the meaning of words may be thus classed. Baptism is simply a question of *philology*, and is to be determined, not by the laws of interpretation, but by the laws of translation. As this word is not translated in our English Bibles, we must seek to ascertain its meaning according to its *Greek* usage, not according to its *English* usage. But it is said this can not be definitely done. Very well; then the whole controversy about baptism should be indefinitely postponed; for, if the Savior has commanded something, and no one can tell what it is, it is certainly very foolish to make our opinions concerning it tests of fellowship. But if baptism is a word of such doubtful meaning, *how do we know that we understand any thing that the New Testament teaches?* It is one of the leading words in the most important commission ever given to men, and it is simply preposterous to suppose that the apostles did not understand its meaning, or that all men can not. In every investigation there are some things which must be regarded as fundamental; and it is just as proper for a Church to decide the question as to whether a man has been baptized, as to determine that which he is to believe. Sup-

pose some one who does not believe in *Christ* presents himself to a Church for membership. He is a moral, upright man. There can be no objection to him because he is unwilling to comply with any of the usages of the Church. He simply says he does not believe in Christ. Would he be accepted? Certainly not. But why not? He is honest, and believes the Church a good moral institution, and wishes to associate himself with its members. But he is not allowed to do this. Wherefore? Evidently because he denies the creed of the Church—that which is the first thing to be considered. Now, if he should say that he does not believe in somebody's *views* of Christ, the case would be quite different. But he denies that which is fundamental in the Christian Religion—*Christ himself*. Precisely so is it with baptism. Should any one refuse to accept my views of baptism, this may be of little consequence; but whoever rejects *baptism itself*—refuses to obey one of the most important commands of Christ—places himself in a position where there should certainly be no hesitancy as to what course is proper to pursue. If we can not determine with certainty what we are commanded to *do*, neither can we determine with certainty what we are commanded to *believe*. And since we are commanded both to *believe* and be *baptized*, we hold that there is just as much bigotry in deciding what the faith is, as what baptism is.

There is only one way that offers the least possibility of escape from this logic, and this will be found to be defective upon a careful examination. It may be said that we *can* determine *definitely* the meaning of baptism; that it means sprinkling, pouring, or immersion; and as it means any one, or all three of these, whoever confines the meaning to immersion gives an interpretation too narrow to the ordinance.

Let us look at this for a moment. Will any scholar translate the original word by the terms sprinkle, pour, and immerse? Every man who knows any thing about the subject knows that the original word bears no such rendering. And, if this be true, then the only way that was left open for escape is effectually closed, and the conclusion is irresistible that there is "one baptism"—immersion into the name of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit. Hence, in receiving members into the Church, we insist upon immersion, not because it is a part of our *creed*, but because having, in our

creed, accepted Christ as Divine, we show our respect for his *authority* when we insist upon a compliance with those things which he has commanded. The same New Testament that reveals to us Christ as our Savior, and teaches us to love him, teaches us also that the proof of this love is in keeping his commandments.*

So far, then, as faith and obedience are concerned, there can be no difference of opinion allowed as to the things themselves. Hence these, and these only, must be made the tests of fellowship in the Christian Church. If men will speculate about these things, let them do so, but they must not formulate these speculations, and invest them with ecclesiastical authority; for just here is where all of our religious troubles begin.

When, however, we come to the subject of experience, there must and will be difference. In fact, it is doubtful whether it would be best to have oneness in all matters entering into the individual Christian life. Men are differently constituted, have different tastes, sympathies, etc. And if there is no place in Christianity where these differences may manifest themselves, it must be evident that we are required to submit to a system of religion which is a palpable contradiction of nature, and as impracticable as it is absurd. But Christianity is no such unwieldy thing. It requires unity in its creed, and strict fidelity to its commandments, but these are only conditions to the enjoyment of its glorious *liberty*. Faith and obedience make us children of God, and as such, we are no longer subjects of bondage, for the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus hath made us free from the law of sin and death.† The law which governs the Christian life is the "law of liberty,"‡ and lays no burden upon the disciples of Christ which they are not able to bear. They are simply exhorted "to grow in grace and in the knowledge of the truth," to "walk worthily of the high vocation wherewith they are called." Hence, Christian *science* can only be studied properly within the great domain of Christian *experience*. But we must be careful not to substitute the things that belong here for the creed of the Church. We must enter the Church with *credo ut intelligam*, though we finally adopt *de omnibus dubitandum est* as our motto in reference to the philosophy and practical details of the Christian life. Christian science is well enough, if it is confined to the Christian life,

* John xiv and xv.

† Rom. viii, 2.

‡ James i, 25.

and is not allowed to usurp the authority of faith; for there can be no science in religion without faith.*

From this lofty stand-point we can survey the whole area of the Christian religion, and speak confidently of the power of that religion to regenerate the world. We feel that when Christ is the object of faith, his commandments the measure of obedience, and his love the inexhaustible source of strength and comfort in the experience of the Christian life, there can and will be no failure. In such a relationship it is impossible that the Christian should be any thing else than the freest of all men. And as a freeman in the Church of the Living God, he will, in all that he does, seek to please him "who, of God is made unto us wisdom, and righteousness, and sanctification, and redemption, that, according as it is written, he that glorieth let him glory in the Lord.†

Such is the religious position that must be occupied, if the world is ever converted to Christ. It is useless to hope that Protestantism, as it is at present, torn asunder by party factions, will ever bring the world to acknowledge Him who is the light and life of men. A restoration of the primitive faith and practice must take place, or else the Church will never get entirely out of the apostasy in which it has been so long. Human symbols of faith must give place to the Divine symbol, the commandments of men must give place to the commandments of Christ, and the hatred and bitterness, party jealousies and strifes of sectarian organizations must be entirely superseded by the glorious love and fellowship of a united Church, built upon the one "foundation of apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ himself being the chief corner-stone."

* "Christian knowledge is a knowledge in *faith*; for only through faith can the human mind become partaker of divine wisdom. *Credo ut intelligam*. A gnosis which starts from an autonomy that discards all assumptions, which assumes that the human mind is able, by its own powers, to evolve the truth out of itself, which desires at the outset to occupy the theocentric stand-point, forgets that the human mind is created, and denies the *creatureship* of man. For faith confesses that human knowledge is that of a creature, that it must rest on experience, that it must begin with an immediate perception of, and contact with, its object, that it must receive the light of truth as a gift which comes down from above, and that it must stand in a relation of humility and trust to the giver. For human knowledge all independence is conditioned by dependence; all self-activity, all *intellectus activus*, is conditioned on susceptibility, on *intellectus passivus*. The false gnosis which will not believe in order to know, denies not only the creatureship of man, but also his *sinfulness* and *need of redemption*."—*Martensens' Christian Dogmatics*, sect. xxx, pp. 58, 59.

† 1 Cor. i, 30, 31.

THE TENDENCY OF THE AGE.

We will now close what we have to say upon the important subject we have had under discussion, by calling attention to the tendency of the present age in reference to human creeds. We do not think it will be seriously denied that the signs of the times indicate a near approach to the day when these symbols will have lost their power as bonds of religious union and communion. The tendency of the present is clearly against dogmatism and centralization. There is a very strong feeling rapidly becoming dominant, which refuses to submit to ecclesiastical legislation in matters of faith; and, unless we are greatly mistaken, all the abnormal religious organizations that are now in existence will find it necessary to greatly modify their present *status* in order to perpetuate their existence. Take, for example, the Methodist Episcopal Church. See what a pressure has been brought to bear upon it for lay delegation; and this is but an entering wedge. What will come of it, all who are acquainted with the lessons of history very well understand. Who believes that such an organization as that Church *was* could be inaugurated *now*, and made to succeed? Surely, no one whose eyes are open to the tendency of the age could believe such a thing possible.

Another hopeful sign is the character of the discussion concerning Christ. This is rapidly becoming the same as in the primitive age of the Church. The question of the present age is not so much *how* Christ is, as *who* he is? The discussion will soon be again between Judaism, as represented by modern Ritualism; Infidelity, as represented by modern Rationalism; and Christianity, as represented by those who plead for a return to the faith and practice of the apostles. And certainly the result of this contest can not be doubtful. Unless we have missed entirely the meaning of passing events, we are confident that the creed question will have a practical solution before many years shall pass away; for every year Christ is becoming more and more the center of attraction in every religious system, and more and more the great hope of the world. We do not mean, however, the Christ of theology—that cold, lifeless, grinning skeleton, concerning whose physics and metaphysics theologians have waged an eternal war, but the living, tender, sympa-

thizing, loving Christ, who once died upon Calvary's cross for the sins of the world, but is now alive for evermore.*

The religious world has for some time been considerably interested in the assembling of the Ecumenical Council at Rome. But the significance of this event is mainly in the fact that it shows the desperation of the Catholic situation. Who, that has any knowledge of the age in which we live, will for a moment suppose that this Council will adopt any thing that will seriously impede religious progress? It may be that the proceedings will have a very different influence upon the world from that which was intended by Pope Pius IX. The purpose in calling the Council together was doubtless to give a special sanction to some of the dogmas of the Church that are felt to be not altogether secure against the rapidly increasing light of the nineteenth century. But whatever the decision of these learned men may be, it will in the end amount to simply nothing. The *individualism* of the present will just as certainly triumph over the despotic *aggregation* of Romanism as that truth

*The preaching of the present is very different from what it was even a few years ago. And we think it will not be long before the pulpit will catch some of the enthusiasm of the primitive days of Christianity. The October number of the *British Quarterly* describes the old and present styles of Evangelical Protestant preaching as follows, which shows that the writer begins to understand the tendency of the age: "The older Evangelism trusted almost exclusively to the attraction of the cross. It took a somewhat narrow view of what was meant by the preaching of Christ crucified, and in seeking to win souls to the Savior it knew scarcely any other magnet than his dying love, his atoning and redeeming passion and death. The Evangelism of our day thoroughly sympathizes with all that the olden Evangelism taught and said upon the glory of the cross of Christ, and is thoroughly at one with it in the conviction that, in a pre-eminent sense and degree, Christ crucified is the power of God and the wisdom of God unto salvation. But it has a broader and more inclusive mode of thought and speech than that. It retains all that the Evangelism of the last generation thought and said; but it adds to the great and fruitful thought that the person of Christ is a potent attraction as well as his cross—his character and life as well as the atonement and reconciliation consummated once for all in his death. The living Christ is, in its eyes, a mighty factor of the Christian life, as well as the dying Christ; and it reckons upon the powerful attraction which the personal Savior has for every soul of higher type which has any yearnings for the true, the beautiful, and the good. In a former day, the appeal of the Evangelical pulpit was almost exclusively to the sense of guilt which rankles in every human soul, and to the fears of coming judgment which such a guilty conscience engenders, and to the sense of duty arising from such a state of lost souls to flee for refuge to the hope set before them in the one only atonement. The Evangelism of our day sums up all the elements of Christ's attraction over human souls, and holds that the fullness of Christ himself is the fullness of his attraction. Unless we hold forth Christ in the plenitude both of what he is and what he does, we are not holding him forth in all the plenitude of his power to draw himself, and to bind to himself forever, in trust, in love, the immortal souls of men."

will ultimately triumph over error. This is an age of freedom to the individual man. Men do not now go to ecclesiastical councils to ask for definitions of faith; but they go rather to the Bibles, which are found in every household. And we think it will be a difficult task for any assembly of Church dignitaries to turn the people back toward the dark ages.

As already stated, one good which has resulted from the multiplicity of creeds is the almost complete demoralization of the creed influence. Hence, men are now seeking for something better, something that is not capable of reproduction into endless contradictions. It may be that men are not always seeking for the *primitive* creed, but it is certain that they are generally aiming to get away from *modern* creeds. Full and complete freedom may not come at once, but it surely will not be long before religious despotism will be overthrown. A sort of semi-anarchy may be better for awhile than eternal bondage. But we have great faith in the power of the truth, and as shackles fall, men will be able to see the truth, and if the truth shall make them free, then will they be free indeed.

II.—CHRISTIAN APOLOGETICS—STRAUSS AND RÉNAN.

IF the very generally received definition of religion as a *modus cognoscendi et colendi Deum* were correct, we might look to the Bible for full information as to this method; yes, we might look to the Bible for a definite number of well-defined doctrines or dogmas, and a system of ethics, that is, duties which man has to his God, himself, and his fellow-man. And we find, accordingly, that those who accept this definition of religion look upon the Bible as a compendium of doctrines and duties to which every one must submit on pain of eternal damnation. Faith in the Bible as such a divine compendium is, for the parties in question, *Christian, saving faith*. A development, a gradual expansion into the clear consciousness of the Church of what is germinally contained in the Bible, is, for this stand-point, out of the question. Like Minerva from the head of Jupiter, armed and equipped, so the Christian religion, that is, a definite number of well-defined doctrines and duties, the Church, with a freely-developed organism, a fixed number of well-defined offices and officers, burst from the brains of its Divine Founder; and this conviction is not at all shaken by the fact, that there is such a variety of systems of dogmas and ethics—as many, in fact, as there are sects or denominations—each party taking it for granted that its own system is the one established by Christ, and that other systems contain only so much truth as they have in common with its own.

However great the admitted difference (in externals) between the Church—as constituted by the Apostles and described in the New Testament—and the Catholic Church in the days of Gregory VII, or Innocentius III, the two constitute, nevertheless, not two, but only one Church; the Pope with the triple crown upon his head, and the fisher-ring on his finger, is the veritable successor of the fisherman Peter; the bishops are the successors, in an unbroken line, of the Apostles; all the peculiar dogmas of that Church, of which there is apparently not even a germ in the New Testament, were orally taught by the Apostles, handed down unimpaired by tradition; and the identity of the Roman with the Apostolical

Church is thus established beyond the possibility of successful contradiction. The same is, if possible, to a still greater extent, the case with the Greek Church, in which absolutely no change in doctrine and creed has taken place since it separated from the Latin Church, and to a great extent, also, with the various Protestant denominations. So the genuine Lutheran sees in the unchanged Augsburg Confession what the Reformed of the Continent sees in the Heidelberg Catechism, the Anglican in the Thirty-nine Articles and the Book of Common Prayer, the Presbyterian in the Westminster Confession, that is, the quintessence of the teachings of the New Testament. And not only this: As the Church must once have realized its idea, must once have been in its normal state, this was actually the case with the Church Catholic during the first three centuries, up to the time when the Christian religion was made by Constantine the religion of State for the Roman Empire; and this normal Church was, as a matter of course, identical with every sect or denomination of the nineteenth century. Church history, from this stand-point, can relate only the outward life of the Church, its geographical expansion, its position over against other religions; whether she ruled, was tolerated, or persecuted; whether she enjoyed peace within, or was distracted by feuds and contentions. A history of dogmas is impossible, as the dogma was given in a finished form to the Church, and was either believed or maliciously rejected. Dissent, heresy, heterodoxy, are the result of intentional perversion of the truth, of wickedness, serving only to cover or to furnish a cloak to immorality and crimes. Not rarely did God signally interfere; and, in order to protect his truth and the Church, the wicked heretics were destroyed before all the people by the avenging hand of Jehovah; as Simon Magus, who before the Roman emperor ascended toward heaven, but fell down and broke his neck in answer to the prayer of Peter; and as Arius, who also miserably perished on the very day when he was to be restored to his rank and office by imperial interference.

That Christianity, in its highest conception, is a life, a life specifically different from that of the natural man, given to the individual believer and the totality of believers in an embryonic state, from which it must develop itself as *conditio sine qua non* of its continuance; that the Apostolic injunction, "grow in grace, and in the knowledge of our Lord and Savior Jesus Christ," is addressed to the

totality of believers as much as to the individual believer; that there are, accordingly, periods of transition from lower into higher stadia; that errors are often the means of bringing about or accelerating this process of development; that erroneous views are as much the consequences of wrong premises as correct views develop themselves from correct data—of all this, the definition of Christianity, which we have been considering, has no idea, and is, as a matter of course, unprepared to grapple successfully with any real or supposed error touching Christianity.

When the healthful life infused by the Reformation of the sixteenth century into the Church waned, and Protestant scholasticism confined true religion to a number of ingeniously worded and well-guarded formulas, the Reformation idea of God experienced the same treatment as other dogmas, and, in consequence thereof, deistical notions of God prevailed. The God of the Bible, who was also the God of the Reformers, differs radically from the God of the Deists, as well as from that of any other school of philosophy. He has personality, self-consciousness, and will; is different from, and superior to, the world, and hence, different from the God of the Pantheist, who is identical with the world; but, while he is different from, and superior to, the world, he is not out of the world, not removed to a great distance from the world, like the God of the Deist, who spends, like the gods of Epicure, his time in ease and enjoyment, unconcerned about the world, which, moreover, does not need his interference, since, like a wound clock, it moves on by its own laws.

In the God of the Bible we live, move, and have our being. He has numbered the hairs of every one of his children; he feeds the fowls of the air, and arrays the flowers of the field. "My Father worketh hitherto, and I work also." He hears and answers prayer, that is, brings to pass, in answer to the prayers of his children, what, without these prayers, would never have come to pass. Where such a faith in God, or rather faith in such a God, has struck root, there is scarcely any danger that unanswerable objections to the truth of the Bible, which is experimentally known, should arise in the mind, or should assail it from without. Miracles and prophecies, though in the present state of things supernatural, have, as it were, become natural; there are no unanswerable difficulties in the way of their reality, and though incidental proofs, of

a high order, of the truth of the Divine revelation, they are by no means the main, and much less the only, proofs of it. But the case is radically different where there is no life-union with God through faith. As religion is here a mere intellectual process, the assent given to certain propositions, and the obedience yielded to certain precepts, the certainty as to the Divine origin of these propositions and commands is likewise arrived at through an intellectual process, namely, that of drawing inferences from proven premises or well-authenticated facts. This theological phase of Christianity is known as *Supernaturalism*, and its evidences are historically as follows: Man has an innate idea of God as a just, holy, and good Being; and as sin, to which man has become heir, estranges man permanently from his God, a Divine revelation, which shows the means by which man can be reconciled to his God, becomes not only very probable and rational, but even absolutely necessary. Such a revelation, in order to prove its Divine origin, must contain mysteries, that is, truths which unassisted human reason could never have discovered. These criteria now are all met with in the Bible, which is thereby proven to be of Divine origin. This is the so-called Rational, or older method; it labors, self-evidently, under great difficulties, since the whole rests on human reason, which fixes the criteria by which to test the claims of the Bible, and then pronounces the claims sustained; and this is done by reason, in its abnormal state, needing, above every thing else, healing, or restoration to its normal state. Hence the transition to the second or historical method was easy, and even necessary. This runs thus: the Apostles and their disciples have composed the writings of the New Testament Canon, as they are now extant (proof of their authenticity and integrity). These writings are entitled to belief. The apostles were able, willing, and, by the nature of things, compelled to tell the truth. Their writings now delineate Christ's pure and sinless character, and relate his miracles, which two points constitute the credibility of his self-testimonies concerning himself, and of his divine mission. Christ, moreover, promised to his followers also the gift of inspiration; his miracles prove that he was able to fulfill this his promise; and his veracity is a guarantee that the promise was actually fulfilled, that the Apostles were inspired. Hence the New Testament, and, on its account, also the Old Testament must be received as inspired, and what the inspired Scriptures teach must

be received as a Divine revelation. The contents of the Bible, its ethics especially, and its teachings on the nature of God, etc., must also be taken into consideration, not in their effects upon the mind, but as they are understood by the natural reason. This natural reason, then, is made supreme umpire in the question about the Divine origin of Christianity; that thereby Christianity is necessarily converted into something *homogeneous to the natural reason*, is self-apparent, but is but slowly admitted by the advocates of this method, since it is still in vogue in England and this country, where Butler's *Analogy* and Paley's *Natural Religion*, though written at a time when Christian life was at its lowest ebb, when a lifeless supernaturalism was the religion of the orthodox, when the conceptions of God and of Divine things were out-and-out deistical, are the text-books in the higher classes of colleges, and in theological seminaries, are commented and lectured upon by eloquent men, and translated into foreign languages, whose people are to be converted to Christianity through these instrumentalities, as the best books in existence next to the Bible!

In Supernaturalism God was separated from the world, as it were, driven out of the world, and an almost impassable gulf created between the two—so, likewise, between flesh and spirit, nature and grace. The influence exerted by one upon the other was considered something abnormal, in no case as a consistent development of the two factors, but as a violation of otherwise immutable laws.

English Deism, which developed itself outside of the Church, took an unqualifiedly hostile position over against the Church, and was *never* scientifically conquered by the Church, unqualifiedly denied the very possibility of the antagonistic factors named exerting an influence upon each other, denied the very possibility of a Divine revelation. Hence, the books that claim to contain this revelation are books full of lies, wickedly invented and propagated by unscrupulous men for selfish purposes. When Deism had put Orthodoxy to flight, it found, to its own astonishment, that it had during the struggle drawn its very life from its opponent, and this being now disabled, it had no strength of its own left. But Orthodoxy and Supernaturalism not being exactly identical with the Christian religion, the latter survived the storm and revived, Supernaturalism surviving unfortunately also.

In Germany the process was different; the inquisitive German

mind, which is contented with nothing short of first causes, denied the existence of an impassable gulf between God and the world, grace and nature, flesh and spirit, making all the phenomena in the world of spirits but the regular developments of natural laws, and denying the reality of those phenomena altogether which could not thus be accounted for. Supernaturalism maintained (and from its stand-point was obliged to maintain) a literal inspiration, but a very superficial criticism even sufficed to upset the claims of such a theory, and when the faith in this kind of inspiration was gone, there being no other kind at hand, the faith in all inspiration was gone, and the sacred books were put on a level with other ancient books, and received an interpretation that relieved them of every thing offensive to unsanctified reason.

The prophecies were easily disposed of; they were either prophecies *post eventum*, as the prophecies of Daniel, or they were so vague, so loose, that they could be made to mean any thing and every thing; a specific difference between the prophecies of the Bible and the oracles delivered at Delphi was not admitted. The miracles were explained naturally, that is, things were supplied to the text that accounted naturally enough for the events stated, while they had the nature of miracles only for the multitude and those that were not better informed. So, for example, the miracle of feeding five thousand hungry men with five loaves and two fishes—the provisions necessary for so large numbers were at hand, but hidden from the multitude, and were brought forward at the proper time; or the wealthy members of the caravan were induced by the discourses of the Savior to communicate of their abundance to those that had nothing. The storm on the sea of Gennesaret, that struck such terror into all, had spent itself, as it is well known that these storms come and cease quite suddenly; Jesus alone preserved his equanimity and serenity of countenance, and as the fury of the elements ceased at exactly the same time that Jesus spoke, the frightened multitude transferred, naturally enough, this natural phenomenon to a miraculous interference of Jesus. Still the Rationalists, properly so-called, professed a high degree of respect and veneration for Jesus—and there is not sufficient reason to doubt their sincerity—he was for them, though a *mere* man, yet the best of men; his ethics were incomparable, while he said and did many things and allowed many others to be said by others,

in accommodation to the prejudices of his countrymen ; of this kind is what he said of the existence of a devil and demoniacs, of the Messianic office, and of himself as the Messiah. The Apostles and Evangelists were, indeed, sincere, but ignorant and easily-misled men, who were more led by the new religious movement than they created and directed it.

Schleirmacher overcame both Supernaturalism and Rationalism scientifically, not by taking out the elements of truth eclectically from the two systems, and uniting them into a new whole, but by creating a new system, which embodied naturally the essential truths of the two old systems, and was free from their errors. Supernaturalism was right in maintaining that Jesus was not the *product*, not *even the flower*, of *humanity*, but something infused into humanity from without, from above. Rationalism was right in insisting upon a consistent, God-ordained method of dealing with man ; and Schleirmacher, by transferring the preparations for human redemption into the very plan of creation, by making the plan of creation and redemption simultaneous, and, to a certain extent, identical, became just to the two systems, avoiding their errors at the same time.

But it was especially by falling back on the spirit of the Reformation, on the *material principle* of Christianity, that Schleirmacher brought about a new order of things. Luther and Calvin had found the forgiveness of their sins, peace with God, etc., through faith in a living Savior. This their faith was, indeed, guided and kept pure by the Bible, but was not entirely dependent on the Bible : hence both reformers, especially Luther, and still more so Schleirmacher, were very bold in their Biblical criticism.

Fichte developed subjectivism to its culminating point, making the *I* the only true reality ; but, by transferring this *I* into the Godhead, he reached a position similar to that of Spinoza, in which a one-sided objectivity swallows up every thing else, even the individual *I*. Schelling came, and undertook to reconcile the two stand-points, absolute subjectivity and absolute objectivity. He was followed by Hegel, who declared, as early as 1807, it to be the chief task of science to unite the substance of Spinoza and the subjectivity of Fichte. Recognizing the claims of this objectivity and subjectivity, these philosophers had to find a final principle, in which these two factors were not only contained, but formed a living whole. This

they found in the Absolute, which is to them, however, neither mere substance, the stiff objective entity of Spinoza, nor the stiff motionless Monas of Deism, but the absolute identity of the substance and subjectivity. As the substance is in and by itself also subjective, so is also the subject in and by itself substance or object, that is, the Absolute is the subject-object. As such, it is neither the one nor the other alone, but it is in itself both, and can thus be the principle of the subjective and of the objective also in the world, the unity of both, of thought and entity. As thus substance and subject penetrate each other in God, God is a living being, and as such, the very opposite of the motionless God of the Deists and of Spinoza, and the prototype of all knowledge, because thinking and being are united in him in absolute knowledge. He is, at the same time, the archetype of the ethical; the highest point of union of all opposites of entity, also of nature and spirit. The "absolute" is the unity of the world-soul and the organized world. God becomes man through the process of nature. Deism and its offspring, Naturalism and Rationalism, can see here nothing but Pantheism, while Spiritualism and nature-hating Idealism see only Materialism. But contempt for nature is any thing but favorable to Christian science, as we see from the Christian doctrine concerning creation and eschatology, from Christology, etc. Nature or corporeity is the indispensable condition of real history, according to Schelling, in itself a world of realized ideas, hence not spiritless. It is reality and the actualization of important ideas. But as Schelling does not distinguish in the universal life clearly between the Monas and the organism, he did not overcome physical Pantheism, and Jacobi was right in pressing over against him the postulate of a *personal* God.

Beyond this nature philosophy, for which the absolute will of nature is the moving cause as a plastic, but as yet unconscious principle, Hegel and his school strove to go. Hegel finds it inadequate to make the contents of the spirit exclusively physical, and makes logic its true and substantial contents. But instead of admitting that his logic gives merely a knowing of possible knowledge, but not yet a knowledge of realities, he makes logic so entirely the whole of truth, that nature, as well as ethics and religion, are to him nothing but logic, that is, subjective.

A follower of Hegel, but a member of the extreme left, was

Strauss, by whom the radical differences of the various schools of the Hegelian philosophy were fully brought to light. He declined, on the one hand, the position of the so-called Wolfenbüttel fragmentist Reimarus, and of the Deists, according to which Christianity owes its origin to self-conscious fiction, deception, and false accommodation, and exposed, on the other, the theory of Dr. Paulus and others, who accounted for all the miracles of the Bible on natural principles, to contempt and ridicule. He opposed to the Biblical supernaturalism, that based the truth of Christianity on inspiration, miracles, and prophecies, the mythical theory, according to which the image of Christ in the Gospels is the product of an unconsciously creative myth, shaped after Old Testament, especially Messianic images, whose historical origin can not be traced; the Christ, to whom the Messianic predicates were applied by the believers (Church), can not have been a supernatural phenomenon, since a miracle is in itself an impossibility; nor can the four Gospels have apostles or eye-witnesses for their authors, because they could not have written them without willfully lying. Strauss, then, claims also to find contradictions in the Gospel narratives, by which he tries to prove their unhistorical character. But as these contradictions refer only to non-essentials, it is evident that it was not *they*, but *something else*, that determined his course. Strauss demands an unbiased historical criticism, while his mythicism shows a twofold bias, namely, a dogmatical and an historical one. His dogmatical bias is his pantheistic, yea, naturalistic conception of God, with which an ethical government of the world, as well as an ethical end of the world, is inconsistent. He believes, with modern philosophy, that God is no stiff, unchangeable entity, but self-moving life, and opposes to Deism and Supernaturalism, that empties the world of the Godhead, a doctrine, according to which there is an inward essential relation between God and the life of men. But this relation is, according to Strauss, not unity in diversity; but God and the world are to him identical. Strauss will have it that the finite must not be separated from God, and that the Infinite receives the finite into itself, whereby it is quickened into life. The idea of the God-human life is, according to Strauss, an integral part of the idea of the Godhead; in such a manner, however, that it is peculiar not to Jesus alone, but to humanity as such. The infinite extension of the Infinite in finite reality is the actuality of the

Infinite. For this very reason, however, he considers it impossible that a single phenomenon of the Universe, which represents only in its totality in eternal harmony God adequately, should be the self-manifestation of God. It is, says Strauss, not the maxim of the idea to pour its fullness into one specimen, and to stint the others; on the contrary, each individual phenomenon is imperfect, finite; hence sinful, and needs completion through the other specimens of the kind. The predicates which the Church applies to Jesus do not belong to the historical Christ, but to the ideal one, that is, to humanity in its ideality. This ideal humanity is constantly being born of God, does miracles, suffers, and dies; but, at the same time, it constantly rises from the dead and ascends to heaven. The *kind*, therefore, and not the *individual Jesus*, is the God-man. Strauss here overlooks the peculiar nature of spiritual graces, which, by being divided, are not diminished. But not only this; he considers the moral perfection of the individual, of even Jesus, excluded by its finiteness, and sees in the excellencies of some a complement of, or atonement for, the defects in others, thus identifying the ethical and physical completely. Strauss overlooks, likewise, that as far as the intention is considered, which alone gives to the deed its ethical character, every individual can, yea must, have a desire to possess the whole truth, because only by longing for the whole, the individual act can be good. If *Strauss did not make so little account of the ethical, his conception of God would be different*. For if the ethical is the highest in God, God's majesty and unchangeable being consists in his holy love, in which he is the living One, and in which both his difference from the world and his self-communication to the world without the loss of self are fully guaranteed.

This purely physical stand-point is also that of his dogmatics. While nature-beings are only kinds—without knowing it—men *know* that they are kinds. But, knowing is not doing; self-conscious nature is not yet spirit, not principle of history. In nature there is only nascent life. Hence, Strauss has no proper idea of history and its end. The world is, according to him, at all times whole and perfect; the restitution of all things is to him the ever-present act of the good proceeding from the evil. The world is good as a unity of the good and the evil; the latter being the *conditio sine qua non* of the former. Personal holiness is to him a

contradiction in terms. If an individual looks upon himself as evil, and condemns himself in his conscience, it is a mere individualizing abstraction; but whoever looks upon himself as a constituent part of the whole, knows thereby that he is reconciled. It would, accordingly, be perverse or evil to strive to go beyond the necessary limit of the good; but moral evil is, thereby, not got rid of, but becomes only an inexplicable mystery. That Strauss strikes at the very root of religion, which is to him but an *inferior* degree of self-consciousness, in which man is not yet conscious of his real worth, and does not dare to claim for himself the really divine, but transfers it to another object, to God as a supra-mundane being, is self-apparent. Nor does ethics fare any better in his hands. The ethical idea is split into an absolute infinitude of deeds, powers, virtues that supplement each other; and this is said to be the correct view, which sees in each defect and in each moral imperfection only the back side of another's reality or virtue, so that the whole atones for the defects of the individual.

As the "many" transfer their own divinity to others, so they worship also the supra-mundane God; the informed, however, the philosophers, who are conscious of their divine nature, worship themselves, the geniuses of the race, each one worshipping others, and being worshiped in turn. They have their saints and demi-gods, their Walhalla, into which they are ready to admit Jesus. The other prejudice of Strauss, displayed in his criticism of the life of Jesus, is historical in its character; he takes it for granted that the Gospels can not have been written by eye-witnesses, because they contain miracles, in their very nature impossible, and apply high predicates to Jesus, which sincere and truth-loving men—and as such the apostles must be regarded—could never have applied to him. Both the miracles and these divine attributes are the product of an unconsciously creative myth, and can not have arisen earlier than a generation after the reported events, and found their way gradually into the faith of the Church. If Strauss admitted the genuineness of but one of the Gospels, or of the reports of miracles contained therein, he would be compelled to fall back upon the position of the Fragmentist, which he, however, at first at least, positively rejected, namely, that the Gospels were a collection of lies, etc. This points out another defect of Strauss's work. He denies,

à priori, the genuineness, not only the credibility of the Gospels. But these documents must have arisen at some time or other, and that within the first period of the Christian religion, to which their whole contents unmistakably point. Strauss denied their origin during this period, but his work was necessarily unfinished, until he showed *when* they were composed. What Strauss had thus left undone was attempted to be done by Baur, and the so-called school of Tübingen, Zeller, Schwegler, Köstlin, Hilgenfeld, Volkmar, Holsten, etc. Baur, who agreed with Strauss in denying the supernatural, said of him, that Strauss had tried to take the fortress of Christianity by surprise, but had failed, and now it could be taken only by regular siege. The later origin of the Gospels, which Strauss maintained without fixing the time of this origin, Baur called *à prioristic arbitrariness*. He himself fixed the dates of this origin as follows: for the Gospel of Luke, about 150; for that of Matthew, 150; and for that of John, about 170 P. Ch.

At first it seemed as if the whole historical criticism of Baur and his school was but the complement of Strauss's work, and altogether in its favor; but the sequel soon proved otherwise. Baur saw that historical things can not be judged without historical sources, and that a criticism without such sources degenerates into an *à prioristic* construction of hypotheses, to which others may be opposed, without reaching thereby any reliable result. While Strauss had denied the genuineness of all the New Testament writings, Baur recognized the following five as genuine, namely, the Epistle of Paul to the Romans, that to the Galatians, and the two to the Corinthians, and the Apocalypse.

As to the historical character of Jesus, Baur maintained nearly the same position as Strauss. He says only of him, that he (Jesus) preached in opposition to the self-righteousness of the Pharisees, purity of heart and love of God and man, and invited men to come to the Kingdom of God. Baur finds fault with Strauss for attempting to write a life of Jesus without a criticism of the Gospels, the sources of this life. He says that Strauss's tactics are, to refute the three synoptic Gospels by that of John, and John's by the synoptic, thereby creating a confusion, which makes any intelligent judgment on the Gospels an impossibility. The religion of the New Testament literature is evidently diametrically opposed to Judaism and heathenism.

What is the origin of this "new" religion? Baur says, that in the days of the Apostles there were Judaizing and heathen Christians, "Petrine" and "Pauline" Christians, as he calls them. The former, to whom the original Apostles also belonged, were and remained, on the whole, Jews, differing from them only through their belief that Jesus of Nazareth was the Messiah; they maintained the necessity of circumcision for salvation, and adhered to the Jewish particularism; and from this he infers that their Christology must also have been *Jewish*, that is, *Ebionitic*. In Paul, however, who was converted through a subjective vision, the barriers of Jewish particularism were burst, the calling of the Gentiles to a participation of the universal salvation was recognized, and in this way a more ideal conception of the person of Christ and of his work prepared.

Paul had to struggle, up to his death, with this Judaism, and succumbed at last. But after his death the two parties drew closer to each other. The increasing enmity of the Jews against the Jewish Christians, and the tragic end of Jerusalem and of the Jewish commonwealth, were the main causes of this approach. Through a series of conciliatory writings—all the books of the New Testament, with the exception of the five named above—the two parties were brought closer together, and, after the first half of the second century, the Catholic Church was formed, with the motto, *Faith and Works*. He insists upon it that, especially, the four Gospels had a later origin, representing the positions of the party in whose interest they were written, and that they can be understood only from these positions. Matthew represents the Jewish, Luke the Pauline standpoint, both in a rather mild form; Mark is neutral; in the Gospel of John the Pauline gnosis assumes a churchly form. The pretended fictions of the Gospels are thus not to be charged to either Jesus or to his disciples, which would be the case if these writings had been composed at an earlier period.

According to Baur, Christianity has thus, no *personal founder*; it had its origin in its renunciation of Judaism, in consequence of those transactions of the Petrine and Pauline parties. Nothing, says Baur, is in names; the idea is every thing. But the *history of nascent Christianity* can not *thus be understood*. The question about the historical origin of the writings of the New Testament necessarily leads to the question about the *historical founder* of Christianity. The question

is, What is the origin of the two factors, which are said to be the condition of this historical movement, and which, though opposed to each other, were held together by a common power, which finally brought about their full union?

How did a party spring up in Judaism which saw in Jesus the Messiah of the prophets, and cheerfully submitted to persecution and death in this belief? As Baur and his school recognize the historical character of Jesus, they can not but admit that Jesus occasioned this belief by his teachings, works, and tragic fate. But how can the original Apostles have remained virtually Jews, if they believed in diametrical opposition to the Messianic idea of the Jews, which they had at first held themselves, in a *low, crucified Messiah*? But if they changed their Messianic idea, this central point of the Jewish religion, how was the change brought about? Here is the place, where, *without any thing analogous to what the Gospels narrate of the works and resurrection of Jesus, and of his teachings concerning his divine character, the historical enigma remains unsolved*, but which the Gospels solve most clearly in a natural, psychological way. Not even with a semblance of historical right can the eschatological declarations of Jesus concerning his person be called in question, because the whole Primitive Church of the Jewish as well as the Gentile Christians is full of eschatological expectations, whose central point is the coming of Christ. If we add to this, that the Apocalypse, whose genuineness is admitted by the Tübingen school, has such exalted views of the person of Christ, speaks of Christ as the Lamb slain for us, in whose blood believers wash their clothes, that is, of the sacrificial death of Christ, and of the abomination of self-righteousness, which fancies to be saved without redemption, almost in the very words of Christ, the points of agreement between the Apostle Paul and the original Apostles are so many and so important, that Baur's hypothesis of a great antagonism between the two parties falls to the ground. The fact is, the original Apostles did *not remain Jews*, but became Christians, although they retained a greater attachment to the Jewish nationality and law than the Apostle Paul. That pretended result of a long conciliatory process was virtually given in the intercommunion between the original Apostles and Paul. In the last place, Christ himself, and not the "process of an idea," nor this or that Apostle, is the founder of Christianity, primarily of the faith

of the Apostles, which was identical in its essentials, because it was conditioned by the impression which the whole self-manifestation of Jesus made upon them.

These are not the only difficulties that beset Baur's theory concerning the origin of Christianity; many of his followers assign different dates to the origin of the different books of the New Testament; so Volkmar, Kösslin, and Hilgenfeld claim the close of the first century for the composition of some of the Gospels; while Ewald, Weiss, and Holzmann are of the opinion that they were written before, or immediately after, the destruction of Jerusalem. But if they were written as early, their authors can not have been free from deception by introducing fictions, etc.

Baur's attempt to fix the dates of the composition of the Gospels necessitated, as we have seen, a second step. The historical date of Jewish and Gentile Christians, who differed from Jews and Gentiles, and formed a unity notwithstanding their differences, points to a common founder, around whom they both rally, although they reflect his image differently, according to their original differences. Criticism could no longer rest here, leaving the founder of the Christian religion wrapped in an impenetrable darkness, as if nothing positive, nothing historically certain, could be said of him; it had to attempt the solution of the problem, which theology had so often challenged; and the very last attempt to avoid this, or to make it appear unnecessary by deriving the main thing from a process after Christ, made it an imperative duty to proceed from the first recognized date, the dualism of "tendencies" within the Primitive Church, to a second date, which accounts for these "tendencies."

It is the merit of Strauss to have seen this, and he accordingly attempts to draw, in his latest edition of his *Life of Jesus*, written for the German "people," an historical, positive portrait of Jesus.

Having said, in the first edition of his work, almost nothing positive about Jesus, only what Jesus could not have been, and having thereby incurred the censure by Baur of having given a criticism of the Gospel history without a criticism of the Gospels, he now charges Baur, in turn, with having given a criticism of the Gospels without a criticism of the Gospel history.

Yet it was not Germany, but France, where negative criticism renounced first its feigned ignorance of the person and history of
Vol. II.—4

Christ, in order to gain a concrete, real image of his person. Ernest Rénan recognizes the synoptic Gospels, to which he assigns the commonly received dates, and, in part, also that of John, as historical sources. But by bringing these records in point of time so near the events which they narrate, he is compelled to deny miracles and the supernatural in Jesus, and does so at the expense of the moral character of Jesus and his Apostles. Rénan, accordingly, admits that the origin of Christianity must be sought in Jesus; but that he might be the founder of the Church, he says it was not enough that he was a mere moralist or philosopher, but his personal, overwhelming influence was necessary for the impression, which is reflected by the Church. Rénan sees, likewise, that the Christian faith, in the divinity of Jesus, which characterized even his first Apostles, can be accounted for in no other way than by assuming that Jesus himself authorized it, by claiming for himself divine origin and attributes. Jesus is to Rénan, accordingly, a *highly-gifted*, "*colossal*" genius, whose endeavors were originally pure and good, but who passed on, in the struggles through which he had to go, *to a dark fanaticism*, full of self-exaltation and self-deification, who did not shrink from lying and deceit, and, therefore, did not perish too late.

Rénan's *Life of Jesus* is, however, not uniformly historical, only isolated points being detailed with historical clearness and precision, while the rest is imaginary, full of inventions and unhistorical dates, so that his Jesus runs parallel with Buddha, Menu, Mohammed, and other oriental founders of religion.

Not so Strauss. He sees in the character and spirit of Jesus a higher unity of the Grecian and Jewish mind. "The purely spiritual and ethical conception of God as the only One he owed to his Jewish education—add to this the purity of his being. But the Hellenic element in Jesus was his cheerfulness, arising from his unsullied mind." Jesus appears to Strauss as an evenly-balanced mind by birth, since the severe struggles he passed through left in his case no scars, nothing of a broken or soured spirit, as is the case with Augustine, Luther, and Paul.

Jesus insisted, in opposition to the dark and dismal tenor of Judaism and its self-righteousness, upon an examination of one's own heart, and conceived of God not as an angry, jealous, and vindictive Jehovah, but as a long-suffering and merciful Father; that is, in an

ethical point of view so as he himself *felt* in the loftier moments of his religious life. "Jesus, by cultivating a frame of mind that was cheerful, in union with God, and embraced all men as brethren, had realized the prophetic ideal of a new covenant with the heart-inscribed law; he had, to speak with the poet, received God into his will; so that for him the Godhead had descended from its throne, the abyss was filled up, all fear was vanished. His beautifully organized nature had but to develop itself, to be more fully and clearly confirmed in its consciousness of itself, but needed not to return and to begin a new life." Thus, the fundamental idea of his religion was humanity, mildness, tolerance; he translated the views of heathen philosophers into religion. But this is, according to Strauss, but the prelude of a higher degree of human development. Jesus did not only not remain free from transient fluctuations and faults, but he lacked also the correct conception of state, commerce, art, and æsthetics, and needs, in these respects, completion. Yea, there is reason to hope for a time when the delusion of a supernatural, personal God, who stands above the world and influences it by his spirit, shall be disposed of forever.

These are the main features of Jesus's personality, which Strauss considers as well established by authentic documents. At the same time, he sees also intentional fiction in post-Apostolic writings. He acknowledges that in consequence of the proofs advanced by Baur, who placed intentional fiction in the place of the mythical, he has assumed a great deal more intentional fiction than he had done at first; and as it can hardly be supposed that later intentional fiction should have framed narratives, giving time, places, names, etc., Baur must be considered as being in the right when he says that the only alternative is between intentional fiction and historical truth in the Gospel records. In this way Baur has—although he agrees with Strauss in the final result, that the Gospels, on account of their supernatural character, are not history—started the process of dissolution of the mythical theory; and Strauss himself, by adopting some of Baur's positions, virtually admits that this theory can not be consistently carried out. Compared with the position of the Fragmentist and of the English Deists, who charged the Apostles and Evangelists with fraud, lying, and deception, the mythical theory was very insinuating, yea even poetical. But, when tested by history,

this charm vanishes, the theory breaks to pieces, and the only alternative left is between intentional fiction and historic truth. It is true, Strauss still labors hard to conceal his retreat to the Fragmentist's position, saying, that even intentional fiction can be called myth, if it finds credence afterward; in this modified sense he still calls his theory mythical, surrounding the trunk of the strictly historical character, given by him to Jesus, with mythical groups of intentional and unintentional fictions. Thus he makes the whole of our Lord's history, prior to his public teaching, the work of fiction. The relation of Jesus to John is colored by the Evangelists, the historical element being, that John baptized Jesus unto repentance; the fictitious addition, that John was Jesus's forerunner, and inducted him into his Messianic office. The miracles are, for the most part, mythical, some intentionally fictitious, although Jesus may have really performed some extraordinary cures. Mythical is also the transfiguration, a good deal of his sufferings, and the ascension. His resurrection rests on subjective visions of his followers. Thus Strauss's method has become eclectic, and he in turn, by showing the necessity of a critical life of Jesus, has frustrated Baur's attempt to derive Christianity from the process of an idea. In assuming the post-Apostolic character of the Gospels, Strauss repudiates, or pretends to repudiate, Rénan's position, who does not hesitate to charge Jesus himself with intentional fraud and deceit, as well as his Apostles. But this his position is not tenable, both on account of the fully established high antiquity of the Gospels, and especially, because Strauss's *portraiture of Jesus is by no means satisfactory to the demands of science, being full of contradictions, and, historically, even impossible.* It is unsatisfactory to science, because it can not account for the historical fact of Christianity and the Church. The historian must show a sufficient cause for every effect. Christianity stands in the midst of the other religions as the religion of reconciliation and peace. The historian must, therefore, historically account for the consciousness of redemption and peace, which the Church had, from the very beginning, as a distinguishing feature from Judaism and heathenism. Strauss is, therefore, not at liberty to ignore the historical character of the Christian Church as an assembly of men that were conscious of their redemption, nor may he assume an effect without an adequate cause; but he is bound to infer, from the Church's

consciousness of redemption, the historical character of him who had the power to redeem. But this course Strauss declines. He loses sight of this trait of the Christian Church, treats the most sacred and certain experience of the Christians, namely, that of pardon found in Jesus, as non-existing, and denies thereby, as far as he can, the historical character of the Church, instead of accounting for its origin and existence. This can be accounted for only by his loose conception of sin, and his naturalistic treatment of the ethical.

Still more. This characteristic feature of the Christian Church must be traced to its founder, his ministry, and his declarations concerning himself. It is altogether inconceivable that the post-Apostolic times should have considered him as their Redeemer and Mediator between God and men, if the Apostles themselves had not preached this very doctrine; and the Apostles could not have preached this doctrine, for which they suffered and died, if Jesus himself had not designated himself as the Redeemer from sin, guilt, and death, and required faith in his person as a religious act, claiming the power to secure to his Church peace in the Holy Ghost. But if this is certain, it answers no purpose to sever all connection between the Apostles and Christ himself, and the high attributes ascribed to him, by assigning to the New Testament literature a post-Apostolic origin. Moreover, Strauss also admits that the eschatological expectations of the Primitive Church, Jewish as well as Gentile, must be traced to declarations of Jesus concerning his coming again in his Father's power, in order to raise the dead and execute the general judgment. By these declarations, Jesus assumes sinlessness, as a sinful man can neither be the Redeemer from sin, nor the judge of the world. Now, as Christ made these declarations, according to the admissions of Strauss, he must have been, as Rénan affirms, fanatic filled with satanic pride, or these declarations corresponded with his inmost consciousness, and were unqualifiedly true. But as Christ's moral and religious character is, even according to Strauss, above every suspicion, and unique in its kind, and as self-knowledge and humility are the basis of a strong, moral, religious life, yea, as humility and consciousness of sin, where sin exists, grow together in equal proportion, Strauss's portraiture of Jesus is simply a *contradiction, an historical impossibility, a logical, moral, and religious monstrosity,*

✱

since he represents him as not free from sin, and asserts, at the same time, the genuineness of those exalted declarations of Jesus concerning himself, which only the sinless could make. If he were a sinner, and possessed only a moderate degree of humility, he could not claim against his better self-consciousness, sinlessness and Divine Sonship; he could not speak of himself as he did, in disgusting lies and unpardonable self-exaltation. Hence, the only alternative is: having made use of these declarations, which he knew were not founded in truth, he is a criminal who wanted to build up the Kingdom of God after he had pulled down its pillars in himself. In this state the question can safely be left with every one that is unprejudiced and has an eye open for ethics and religion. Thus negative criticism has finished its course, being driven from all its phases—Rationalism, Mythicism—and compelled to return to the position of the Fragmentist. What the Church, what Christian science has gained by this long and fearful struggle is of the highest order; every low and unsatisfactory view of Christianity, Supernaturalism, Ecclesiasticism, etc., has been overcome and left behind. Christianity is now known to be a new life in God, specifically different from natural life, and having its origin, and continuance, and perfection in the God-man Jesus Christ. Whoever has by faith been brought into a living union with his Savior is no longer afraid that, by any critical labors, or any philosophical theory, the foundation of his new life can be sapped; he has no interest in stifling criticism, and awaits its results with calmness. This is, on the main, the position of modern theology in Germany—why not every-where else? In this country, must a course be pursued whose destructive effects only the good sense of the people and the deep religious feeling of the believers have so far measurably paralyzed? We say *measurably*, because infidelity, scholarly infidelity, is making fearful progress; it is, especially, the armory of the school of Baur that has been appropriated in England and America by kindred spirits, and, adapted to local and national circumstances, is handled with fearful effect. What can the Apologetics of the eighteenth century, that was directed against Deism, and stood, on the whole, on deistic ground itself, as we have it in Butler's *Analogy* and Paley's works, do against this criticism? Not more than any number of batteries against the Rocky Mountains! The Protestant Churches, that trace their origin to the sixteenth century, and Meth-

odism, that is but a modification of Episcopalianism, by adopting, or rather adhering, to this kind of Apologetics, become faithless to their own better inheritance. None of the great Church-parties of the sixteenth century, neither the Lutheran nor the Reformed, neither on the Continent nor in England, *would* have rested, *could* have rested satisfied with an argument made up exclusively of *inspiration, miracles, and prophecies*, assigning to unregenerate reason the enormous task to *prove the supernatural origin of the Bible*, removing Christ virtually out of sight, and assigning to him the position of Plato or Confucius, thus totally ignoring the self-proving element of Christian faith. Prophecies are intended only for believers, and are, as well as miracles, mere *helps of faith*. The Bible recognizes the reality of Satanic miracles as well as that of Divine miracles—hence there must be a test for miracles themselves, which can not be a miracle. Faith, moreover, is inconsistent with demonstration; what is aimed at in the common argument would virtually be demonstration, and were this realized, it would *destroy the very possibility of faith*. The highest miracle, the miracle of miracles, is *the person of Jesus of Nazareth* in its totality as described in the New Testament writings. If Jesus is brought within the reach of the human heart, he exerts an almost irresistible power of attraction, he being for the heart what the sun is for the eye, as Goethe has said with as much force as truth:

“Wär’ nicht das Auge sonnenhaft,
Wie könnten wir der Sonne Licht erblicken?
Lebt nicht in uns des Gottes eigne Kraft,
Wie könnt uns göttliches entzücken?”

(If our eye was not sun-like in its construction,
How could we see the light of the sun?
If God's own power did not live within us,
How could we take delight in the Divine?)

III.—THE NEWSPAPER AND PERIODICAL PRESS.

MORE than half a century ago, a writer of some sagacity gave his impressions of the influence of the newspaper press of our country in the following words :

"The general circulation of *Gazettes** forms an important era, not only in the moral and literary, but also in the political world. By means of this powerful instrument, impressions on the public mind may be made with a celerity, and to an extent of which our remote ancestors had no conception, and which can not but give rise to the most important consequences in society. Never was there given to man a political engine of greater power ; and never, assuredly, did this engine before operate upon so large a scale as in the eighteenth century.

"Our own country in particular, and especially for the last twelve or fifteen years, has exhibited a spectacle never before displayed among men, and even yet without a parallel on earth. It is the spectacle, not of the learned and the wealthy only, but of the great body of the people ; even of a large portion of that class of the people which is destined to daily labor, having free and constant access to public prints, receiving regular information of every occurrence, attending to the course of political affairs, discussing public measures, and having thus presented to them constant excitements to the acquisition of knowledge, and continual means of obtaining it. Never, it may be safely asserted, was the number of political journals so great, in proportion to the population of a country, as at present in ours. Never were they, all things considered, so cheap, so universally diffused, and so easy of access.

"The general effects of this unprecedented multiplication and diffusion of public prints form a subject of most interesting and complex calculation. On the one hand, when well conducted, they have a tendency to disseminate useful information ; to keep the public mind awake and active ; to confirm and extend the love of freedom ; to correct the mistakes of the ignorant and the impositions of the crafty ; to tear off the mask from corrupt and designing politicians ; and, finally, to promote unity of spirit and action among the most distant members of an extended community. . . . On the other hand, when an instrument so potent is committed to the weak, the ignorant, and the vicious, the most baneful consequences must be anticipated."

After speaking of journalism in the United States during the latter part of the eighteenth century as being, to a considerable extent, under the control of persons "destitute at once of the urban-

*The origin of this term, so long a favorite name of newspapers, is worth noting : Early in the seventeenth century a newspaper was printed at Venice, for which the price charged was a Venetian coin, called *Gazetta*. The name of the coin was transferred to the paper ; hence our word *Gazette*.

ity of gentlemen, the information of scholars, and the principles of virtue," he adds :

"If the foregoing remarks be just, then the friends of rational freedom and of social happiness can not but contemplate, with the utmost solicitude, the future influence of political journals on the welfare of society. As they form one of the great safeguards of free government, so they also form one of its most threatening assailants. And unless public opinion (the best remedy that can be applied) should administer an adequate correction of the growing evil, we may anticipate the arrival of that crisis in which we must yield either to an abridgment of the liberty of the press or to a disruption of every social bond."*

We have given liberal extracts from this author, both on account of his just reflections on a very grave subject, and for a basis of thought in regard to the influence of the newspaper press of our own day. If he was amazed at the power of the press then, and somewhat alarmed lest that power should be turned to evil, what would he feel and say were he living now !

Another writer, of rather later date (1810), speaks of the "almost incredible number" of newspapers issued at that time.† The fullest statistics of that time give us 350 papers—27 daily, 15 tri-weekly, 38 semi-weekly, and 270 weekly—and among all these there was but one of a religious character ! The number of papers issued annually is estimated at 22,222,200. The regular issue of the best dailies was 500, 600, and 625, "though it is known," says our author, "that the number impressed of some of the daily papers is not less each day than 1,300; and many of the papers published semi-weekly and weekly, in New England, give from 2,000 to 4,500 at each impression." To these must be added 25 periodicals, most of them monthly.

Now, in 1860, the number of newspapers and periodicals published in the United States was 4,013, and, at the present time, according to the most careful computation, is 4,575. Their circulation, in 1860, was 12,829,061; while in 1850, the number was but 2,526, and the circulation 5,182,117. The number of religious papers and periodicals in 1860 was 271, with a circulation of 1,071,657, against 191 in 1850; against 1 in 1810 ! When, in place of one and two thousand daily issues, in 1810, we think of the 50,000 daily circulation of established journals in 1860; the 4,500 issues of the best weekly papers then, and the 100,000, and even 200,000 issues of weeklies now; and consider, along with this, the immense increase

* Miller's Retrospect of the Eighteenth Century.

† Isaiah Thomas.

in size, and improvement in matter—the entire reconstruction of journalism to meet the wants of a rapidly advancing age—it becomes almost amusing to listen to the sensational utterances of 1810 as to the incredible increase in the circulation of papers, and the mammoth proportions of power attained by the press of our country. We have not forgotten, either, that the witty Sydney Smith, less than fifty years ago, amused himself with thinking of the ages that would elapse before our muscular, but sadly illiterate Americans, would perform their herculean task of conquering the soil to the Pacific coast; after which, he graciously condescended to admit they might turn their attention to letters, and obtain some inferior niches in the temple of literary fame. He would scarcely have believed an angel from heaven announcing to him that within half a century this people would plant an empire on the Pacific coast—flash intelligence from it with lightning speed to the Atlantic, and through the Atlantic to Europe and Asia—open a highway to New York, admitting of comfortable and even luxurious travel from ocean to ocean in less than a week—command Asiatic commerce from their western coast—and, in the midst of all these stupendous undertakings, furnish Longfellow, and Whittiers, and Lowells, and Bancrofts, and Prescotts, and Motleys, to challenge the admiration of England's highest literary circles; and Peabodys to receive the homage of Queen, and nobles, and bishops, along with the gratitude of Britain's homeless poor, for matchless benefactions!

Yet there was reason to wonder, even over the growth which, in our day, looks so diminutive. In 1800 the number of papers in the United States was but 200, most of them weeklies—the first daily having been published in 1784. In 1776 there were but 37 papers—all weeklies but one, and that issued only semi-weekly. We have only to go back to 1690 for the appearance of the first paper in what is now the United States, and of that but one number was issued. In the month of April, 1704, appeared the first issue of the first permanent newspaper in this country—the *Boston News Letter*—printed on a half-sheet of paper 12 inches by 8, with two columns on each page. In 1638 a printing-house had been opened in Cambridge, and in 1639 the first printing was done within the limits of our territory. But this, with the press which was added to it in 1660, was employed chiefly in printing pamphlets, almanacs, psalm-books, and the

Bible and other books, which the pious and heroic Elliott had prepared for the Indians. It was fifteen years before another newspaper was established. Connecticut published its first newspaper in 1755; New Hampshire in 1756; New York in 1725; Pennsylvania in 1719; New Jersey not until 1777; Maryland in 1728; Virginia in 1736; South Carolina in 1732; North Carolina in 1755; Georgia in 1763; Vermont in 1781; Kentucky in 1786, and Ohio in 1795. In 1810 it is mentioned with surprise, as an evidence of the magical progress of Ohio, that she had 13 newspaper establishments.

The first newspapers were not only small in size, but often feeble in ability, and channels rather of gossip, abusive personalities, local intelligence, and party virulence, than vehicles of general intelligence. It is amusing to hear the editor of the *Boston News Letter*, in 1717, confess that he was "thirteen months behind with the foreign news beyond Great Britain." Yet, small as these papers were, and limited as was their circulation, they were a terror to the Conservatives of that time, and numerous efforts were made to suppress them.

Sir William Berkeley, who was Governor of the colony of Virginia thirty-eight years, said, in 1671, sixty-four years after the settlement of that territory:

"I thank God we have not free schools nor printing; and I hope we shall not have these hundred years. For learning has brought disobedience and heresy, and sects into the world; and printing has divulged them and libels against the Government. God keep us from both."

Lord Effingham, who was appointed Governor in 1683, was ordered "to allow no person to use a printing-press on any occasion whatsoever." Hence there was but one press in the colony until the beginning of the Revolutionary strife, and that so completely under the Governor's control that no free discussion was allowed in its columns. Its subscription price was fifty dollars a year!

In Massachusetts the appearance of the first newspaper immediately arrested the attention of the Colonial Legislature, which declared its publication to be contrary to law, and took such measures that no second number is known to have been published. For a long time the papers in that colony were published "by authority;" and it is well known that the first appearance of Benjamin Franklin's name as publisher grew out of the fact that his brother James

was imprisoned for publishing the *Courant*, and forbidden to publish it any more.

Indeed, the early history of newspapers in our country is largely a history of the troubles, perplexities, and sufferings of printers and editors, growing out of their conflicts with the civil authorities. Even the liberty-loving Quakers, who boast of their freedom from a persecuting spirit, are not entirely without stain. The history of their colony has preserved an instance of intolerance and petty tyranny that would not have dishonored the most rigid of Puritanical persecutors. William Bradford and John M'Comb were imprisoned for "Publishing, Uttering, and Spreading a Malicious and Seditious paper, entitled, An Appeal from the Twenty-eight Judges to the Spirit of Truth, etc." The record of the trial of these Quaker offenders before Quaker justices, apart from the peculiar Quaker phraseology in which the parties express themselves, has nothing in it to distinguish it from trials in other colonies. The same dread of a free press, the same stubborn determination to crush its power, is manifest.

We must take a step or two further backward to enable us to appreciate more fully the stupendous growth of "the art preservative of all arts," and the immense intellectual and moral forces now at work in society which, only a few centuries ago, were unknown.

The edition of the Bible which was printed at Mentz, with Schœffer's newly invented types, is said to have been five years in the press; and it was calculated that the expense amounted to four thousand florins before they had printed the twelfth sheet. It is supposed to have been this edition which Faust took to Paris, and sold, first for six hundred crowns per copy, then for five hundred, and finally for thirty. His ability to furnish copies so rapidly led to the belief that he was in league with the devil, and produced the books by magic. His house being searched, several Bibles were found, and the red ink with which the illuminators had made the great capitals at the beginning of each chapter, was pronounced to be his blood. Only by flight did he escape death. Hence the story of "The Devil and Dr. Faustus."

Going back to Wyclif's time—only a little before Laurentius, Guttenberg, Schœffer, and Faust gave the art of printing to the

world, the price of a Bible, fairly written in manuscript, with a commentary, was not less than thirty pounds.

"A most enormous sum," says one writer, "for it would have more than built two arches of London Bridge, and no workingman could ever have attained it, with his pay of three half-pence a day, unless, indeed, he had been fifteen years in working for it."

"About the year 1400, a copy of John of Meun's *Romum de la Roze* was sold before the palace gate, at Paris, for forty crowns."

"About the commencement of the fourteenth century, there were only four classics in the royal library at Paris; the rest were chiefly books of devotion; the classics were Cicero, Ovid, Lucan, and Boëthius."

"The library of the University at Oxford, before the year 1300, consisted only of a few tracts, chained, or kept in chests in the choir of St. Mary's Church."

"When a book was bought, the affair was of so much importance that it was customary to assemble persons of consequence and character, and to make a formal record that they were present at the sale."

"If any person gave a book to a religious house, he believed that so valuable a donation merited eternal salvation; and he offered it on the altar with great solemnity."

"The library of the Bishop of Winchester, in 1294, contained nothing more than *Septemdecim parti librum de diversis scientiis*. That prelate, in 1299, borrowed of his cathedral convent of St. Swithin, *Bibham bene glossatam*—the Bible with marginal annotations; but gave a bond for the due return of the loan, drawn up with great solemnity."

"At the beginning of the tenth century, books were so scarce in Spain, that one and the same copy of the Bible, St. Jerome's Epistles, and some volumes of ecclesiastical offices, etc., served several different monasteries."

Such facts as these, far better than an elaborate essay, impress the mind with a sense of the potency and value of the forces now operating every-where in civilized society, and even among barbarous tribes, by means of the press; a potency whose beneficence is felt, not only in the general diffusion of knowledge among the masses, but in opening new and grand domains of inquiry and discovery to the learned, and in creating a commerce of mind among students every-where, laying at the feet of every citizen in the Republic of Letters the intellectual treasures of all lands and all ages.

It is impossible to study such statistics as we have furnished of the newspapers and periodicals of the United States without a solemn impression of the prodigious force which, for evil or for good, is constantly asserted over the American mind—creating the tastes, controlling the judgments, fashioning the principles, and

swaying the passions of the people, and molding the destinies of the nation. Especially is this felt in reference to the secular press—the daily and weekly newspapers, which enter into almost every American home, and are constantly read at every hearth-stone, by little children, gray-haired sires, young men and maidens, and by all classes, from the President in the White House, and the scholar in his library, down to the daily laborer, the street-scavenger, and the very beggar that cries for bread. Journalism has grown into a grand sovereignty, so that the editor of a leading journal sways a scepter more potent and more dreaded, in his gray goose-quill, than belongs to civil or ecclesiastical rulers. It is not surprising that the Pope thunders against the freedom of the press as a damnable heresy; for through its power the triple crown is fast becoming a contemptible bauble, and the once resistless potentate, at whose gate the proudest of monarchs waited, shivering in the cold, vainly soliciting an audience, and whose word could absolve the inhabitants of kingdoms and empires from allegiance to their rulers, dwindles into the pettiest of princes—the most helpless of dependents—from whose feeble grasp are slipping the last poor remains of political power.

The Emperor of France has not dared to cope with the power of a free press, well knowing how impotent he is to resist its attacks. He could face the power of Austria at Solferino, and storm the might of Russia in her most impregnable fortresses; but he dare not enter on an equal contest with the editors of a free press. "The pen is mightier than the sword." The Thunderer of the Vatican is an imbecile in the presence of the Thunderer of the *London Times*. The most potent sovereigns of Europe to-day are less regal in the exercise of power than some knights of the quill we wot of, in the Old World and the New, who, from dingy little rooms, in the midst of the dust and grime; and noise and strife of a tumultuous world, are giving forth "thoughts that breathe and words that burn," which command the respect, and even reverence, of the civilized world.

The daily paper, in our country, is a wonderful "institution," with its large and costly building, its well-arranged offices and work-rooms, its expensive mechanical equipments, its crowd of compositors, pressmen, clerks, editors, reporters, proof-readers, mailers, etc.; its enormous correspondence, its telegrams, its reams of paid contributions, its

confused heaps of voluntary offerings, its piles of exchanges; the everlasting scrape of pen, and click of type, and clatter of machinery, mingled with the incessant talk and jabber of comers and goers that throng the passages or transact business at the desk; and the unceasing toil which, day and night, with scarcely an abatement on the Lord's day, is employed to minister to the public appetite for the latest news and the most important intelligence. While the sheet is yet damp from the press, and almost before the news-boy has time to fold it, its contents are devoured by myriads of eager readers, with the greatest avidity. Not only in the city where it is printed, but, by means of railways, in hundreds of cities, towns, and villages, it empties its contents into a hundred thousand minds within a few hours. The latest doings of the civilized world are known and understood, discussed and passed upon, soon after sunrise of the following day—the last move of kings on the political chess-board, and the last brutal contest in the prize-ring, in all its disgusting details; the diplomacy of cabinets, and the shrewd tricks of confidence-men; the proceedings of Parliaments and Congresses, with speeches teeming with the eloquence and wisdom of the greatest orators, or pregnant sentences from statesmen, on whose words hang the destinies of nations, and the babble and fanatical extravagance of verdant reformers, in their first inexperienced efforts to ventilate some new ideas of progress in politics, morals, or religion; the movements of armies, the issues of battle, the rise and fall of empires, the shock of earthquakes, the sweeping tempest, the desolations of fire and flood—and the last brilliant wedding celebration, the last dramatic sensation, the last joke of Prentice, or the latest fun at the Varieties; high deeds of heroism and black deeds of crime; Fifth Avenue revelries and Water-street tragedies; the splendors of fashion and the horrors of the brothel; the proceedings of General Assemblies and of Police Courts; sermons from the pulpit and speeches from the gallows; revival meetings and the excitements at the gold room; the markets and the races; railroad accidents and church dedications; shipwrecks and picnics; daring robberies and enthusiastic temperance meetings; working-men's conventions and splendid balls of shoddyites at Saratoga; good news from heathen lands and a bloody battle with the Indians; pulpit eloquence and stump oratory; pleasure excursions and suicides; the price of stocks and daring bank-robberies;

scientific discoveries, literary gems, Tennyson's last poem, and Nasby's latest reflections on the state of the country, and the matchless performances of the Davenport boys; the opera, the Fulton-street prayer-meeting, the last speech of Gladstone, wonderful feat of a rope-walker at Niagara Falls, affecting scene at a funeral, and the coming prize-fight. It is certainly "a great sheet," very much like that which Peter saw in vision, filled with "all manner of four-footed beasts of the earth, and wild beasts, and creeping things, and fowls of the air," though it can scarcely be said, like Peter's, to be "let down from heaven." It is well if, with Peter, our minds are enlarged, and not defiled, and we can go from its contemplation with larger heart to nobler life. Stranger varieties than Macbeth's witches used in their incantations are daily mingled in the seething caldron of the newspaper press, and surely no necromancer ever commanded within the enchanted circle of his wishes such a medley of "black spirits and white, red spirits and gray," as the editor of a daily paper holds at his beck, to unfold the world's mysteries to his readers.

Along with all this *olla podrida* of news, wit, fashion, crime, and casualty, are profound political disquisitions, monetary and commercial statistics and theories, learned discussions and criticisms, in literature, science, and art, trenchant rebukes of folly and vice, grave and graceful ethical essays, adapted to the living issues of the day, history, biography, travels, serial novels from eminent authors, careful and learned reviews of the most important books; in a word, whatever is of the freshest interest and greatest value in the realms of matter and of mind, will be found in surprising profusion, furnished in most attractive style, in the columns of the daily paper.

Dr. Rush, in his bequest for a Public Library in Philadelphia, made a special restriction, that no place was to be given to "mind-tainting reviews, controversial politics, nor for those teachers of disjointed thinking, the daily papers." In this we think he was mistaken. For some reason he was morbidly sensitive on this subject. He was one of a class which regards the newspapers of our country as exerting a dissipating influence; as catering to a love of novelty—a prurient desire for sensational excitements, at war with a serious habit of protracted and patient study. It is worthy of remark that, in the early history of printing, the same objection was urged against multiplying books; and there is about as much truth in its appli-

cation in the one case as in the other. There is often as much solid food in the original articles of our daily and weekly press as in most of the books of our time. In fact, our book-writers are our newspaper writers. The best minds of the age are laid under tribute to enrich the columns of our journals. Journalism is fast becoming a science; and it is not beneath the dignity of the most richly stored and highly cultivated minds to contribute to newspapers of established reputation. True, their essays are for immediate consumption. Like hot cakes, they must be swallowed before they cool, or they soon become flat, stale, and unpalatable. But the immense range of immediate influence makes it worthy of the best effort to control myriads of minds to-day, rather than to address a small, select circle of readers in a book that stands a fair chance to incumber the booksellers' shelves as dead stock. Indeed, few books have so ready and extensive a sale as those which have first appeared in broken portions in newspapers and magazines, and have received the approval of the public there. We need not be surprised, therefore, that such men as "Junius," Cobbett, Hazlitt, Leigh Hunt, Barnes, Douglas Jerrold, Thackeray, Dickens, Jeffrey, Wilson, Sir David Brewster, Mackintosh, Brougham, and Macaulay are found among the foremost contributors to the newspaper and periodical press of Great Britain; and Rousseau, Prévot, Linguet, Geoffroy, Guizot, Cousin, Jouffroy, Carnot, Thiers, Mignet, and Emile de Girardin, to those of France. It is needless to mention eminent names in our own country.

At all events, whether it is most desirable or not, the public mind is fed from this source more than from any other, and thus will it continue to be. The masses have but little time for reading. They must get their knowledge in fragments, and in condensed paragraphs. It is not probable that fewer books are read than would be if we had less reliance on newspapers. On the contrary, we think the minds of readers are stimulated to farther inquiry, and they proceed from papers to books. This, however, is certain: tens of thousands who would never read books read the papers, and receive their inspiration largely from them.

What we have said of papers is more or less applicable to magazines. The immense sales of such monthlies as Harpers', the Atlantic, the Galaxy, Godey's, Demorest's, Frank Leslie's, Ballou's, and numerous others, prove that a tremendous power is wielded over the people

by their means. We remember that Washington Irving once gave a piece of advice to young men, to avoid this class of popular literature as too shallow and too highly seasoned for mental health and vigor. But it is useless to reason against it. The people demand it. The demand will be supplied. We can only hope to influence those who supply the demand, by a view of their fearful responsibility, to use their power wisely, and make it minister to good.

Then we have the religious press. There are, in the United States, as already stated, 271 religious papers and periodicals—the larger part of them weeklies. Their aggregate circulation is 1,071,657. The largest and most influential of these claim a circulation ranging from 30,000 to 75,000. Of Sunday-school papers the circulation is often larger. While the range of influence of the religious press is much more limited than that of the secular, it nevertheless acts on the best portion of the population, and bears with it a sanctified aim, and a sacredness of purpose, which necessarily impart to it an unusual power for good. It is a force of immeasurable greatness.

A peculiar kind of literature is found in papers and magazines for the young. It is wonderful to learn of the literary ability and artistic skill employed in behalf of our juvenile population. From the *Nursery*, a most charming monthly for those just beginning to read, and the *Children's Hour*, an exquisitely beautiful and attractive magazine for those a step in advance, up to *Our Young Folks*, *Riverside*, *Leslie's Monthly for Boys and Girls*, *Once a Month*, and others too numerous to mention, there is a graded literature for children and youth which, with few exceptions, is most admirably adapted to its ends—combining amusement with instruction, and conveying solid information in history, biography, science, art, and morals, in a very simple and entertaining style.

There are yet other classes of journals of which we can only speak in terms of strong reprobation, and which we would gladly omit from our enumeration; but they comprise no light portion of the power of the press over the public mind, and must be taken into the account. We allude to the lower type of literary and sensational journals, filled with tales of horror and narratives of crime, illustrated with flaming wood-cuts, and abounding with love-adventures, hair-breadth escapes, and tragical events, familiarizing the reader with the gross-

ness, slang, and semi-barbaric grotesqueness of manners of the lower orders of our city population, or leading them along the more attractive, but scarcely less corrupting, paths of popular vice, amidst the gilded hypocrisies and witching dissipations of higher circles of fashionable iniquity.

We wish to say distinctly that we do not class the *New York Ledger* with these. It is not positively bad. It is negatively good. It is free from immoralities, and refuses to cater to vile tastes. Mr. Bonner is, perhaps, doing a good work in catering to the taste for light and sensational reading in a way that holds tens of thousands from that which is positively bad, and enlists them in the cultivation of desires for a higher order of literature; yet we seriously doubt whether his *Ledger* is worthy of the hold it has on Christian households—whether it supplies the healthful and invigorating literature needful for the enlightenment and control of the young. But we speak more especially of the Ned Buntline style of vulgar sensationalism—such coarse and degrading, and corrupting novelettes, tales, and narratives as fill the pages of numerous weeklies, whose names shall not be so much as mentioned here. No one who travels on the cars or steamboats, or watches along our thoroughfares, or visits the abodes of the poorer classes, can fail to be observant of the wide-spread and pernicious influence of this Satanic literature.

It becomes an exceedingly grave question, in the presence of this enormous power: Is it, on the whole, wielded for good? Can we count on the newspaper and periodical press to aid the cause of freedom, and to minister to the nobler wants of human nature? Is it purifying, emancipating, elevating in its influence? Does it conserve the best interests of society?

Our answer to all such inquiries is hopeful. It is too much to say that the influence of a free press is unmixed with evil. Freedom necessarily accepts many risks. A free press can never be fully exempt from extravagances and mischiefs. But we believe that in the large view its influence, in our country, is safe and healthy, and that its attendant evils are as nothing in comparison with the evils that must always flow from restrictions on its freedom. If it is free for evil, it is free, also, for good; and in a fair contest between good and evil, good is sure to triumph. Nay, the press is freer for good than for evil. The law restrains it within the limits of decency; and,

from the very nature of the advocacy of evil, it is self-embarrassed by its own corruptions. But the advocacy of justice and goodness is without impediment, and is sure to make itself respected by the good and dreaded by the bad. The moral power of an unfettered press, devoted to truth and righteousness, is immeasurable. It flashes light on the dark deeds of evil, and reveals to the public gaze the wrongs and outrages that have gone unwhipped of justice. It drags the unfaithful and dishonest before the bar of public opinion, and brands them with ineradicable marks of infamy. It withers fashionable follies, in witty and stinging paragraphs, rebukes crime by scathing exposures and denunciations, sifts out error by discriminating investigations and inexorable logic, revolutionizes public opinion by its bold array of facts and arguments, and stirs the popular heart with its earnest and eloquent appeals.

The Duke of Northumberland, in conversation one day with Lord Mansfield, spoke of the comfort of reading the newspapers at breakfast. "The comfort of reading the newspapers!" said Lord Mansfield: "mark my words; you and I shall not live to see it, but, sooner or later, these newspapers, if they go on as they now do, will most assuredly write down the Dukes of Northumberland out of their titles and possessions, and the country out of its king. Mark my words, for this will happen."

When Napoleon was applied to by one of his favorites for an appointment for a friend, "What has he done?" he asked. "He has been a journalist." "A journalist!" repeated the first consul. "That means a grumbler, a censurer, a giver of advice, a regent of sovereigns, a tutor of nations. The *cabanons* of Bicetre are the fittest places for people of that stamp."

This dread of journalists, on the part of privileged classes and sagacious despots, is the highest tribute to their genuine worth; and if this were true of the journalists of that time and of those countries, with much more emphasis may a similar tribute be paid to the journalists of our own land.

We are aware of the prejudice of many, that newspapers are but the willing and subservient organs of their patrons, and but reflect the sentiments, true or false, of the parties that sustain them. Were this entirely true, it must be remembered that there is equal freedom for all parties; and the mutual task of vindicating truth and

exposing error is apt to lead to safe conclusions. But it is scarcely half true. Newspapers create, as well as reflect, public sentiment; and more and more is it evident that, where the press is free, the public sympathy gathers about the bold, brave men who dare to be true to their convictions, and fulfill their mission with integrity, as well as with ability. The timorously conservative presses, and the venal, are not the favorites of the people; nor is their course found to be the highway to success. Even those presses which are regarded by good men as evil in their influence, do not generally owe their success to that which is evil. They succeed in spite of the evil that is in them, because they render themselves indispensable by the enterprise and vigor with which they minister to the actual wants of the people.

Let those who fear the influence of the press compare the condition of our country with that of the countries mentioned in the following statement. The facts were published in 1850, but are substantially true in the year of grace 1870:

"In all Syria, with a population of a million and a half, not a single newspaper is published. In the entire region in which the Arabic language is spoken, comprising Syria, Arabia, Egypt, and the Barbary States, including a population of forty millions, there is believed to be only one, if indeed one, newspaper in that language, and only three or four in English or French. There is but one in the Turkish language, in all the Turkish dominions, (including a population of sixty millions,) and that conducted by an Englishman. The first newspaper in the Turkish dominions, as well as in several of the heathen countries, was started by American missionaries. It is an interesting fact that Armenian, Greek, and Judean journals, as also those of China, Africa, and the Sandwich Islands, are now copying religious, as well as political intelligence, from *American daily papers*."

We have spoken of journalism as rapidly growing into a science. While it is not yet organized in this country as completely as in England, and lacks that *impersonality* without which it can never be properly systematized, it is fast growing into an organized power in our metropolitan presses; and these give tone and shape to the journalism of the country. Ben Jonson, in his play called the "Staple of News," written in the first year of Charles I, gives a description of a newspaper office in its best estate at that period:

"This is the outer room where my clerks sit,
And keep their sides, the register i' the midst;
The examiner, he sits private there within;

And here I have my several rolls and files
Of news by the alphabet, and all put up
Under their heads."

Such a description would be counted meager now by the proprietors of our country newspapers. The extensive establishments of our cities, and their costly equipments, requiring large capital, and seeking large returns, result necessarily in the employment of the best writers, and in such a division of labor as secures the best talents in each department. There is, therefore, no comparison between the ability and vigor of the newspapers of the present and of the last century.

That there has been a hopeful growth in our newspaper press let us show by an extract from the *New York Evening Post*, of October 13, 1796. We give it *verbatim et literatim*:

"Last Friday arrived here Capt. Griffin from Boston, who informs, that as soon as they heard of the French Fleet, the Bostoneers was in the greatest hurrey imaginable to Fortifie the Place, which they have done in a very strong manner; that there *wat* 30,000 fighting men, wereof was 700 Horse; they are very well provided with all manner of war like stores, and ready, if *Monsieur* should pay them a visit, to give him a very warm reception."

Compare that with the *Evening Post* of to-day—and measure the progress of journalism! This may be regarded as scarcely a fair specimen. Yet we venture to say that a comparison between even the Boston press of that time and the Boston press of to-day will show as great a gulf between them.

Enough has been said in support of the hopeful view we expressed as to the wholesome influence of our newspaper and periodical press, although much more might be said, especially in behalf of our Quarterlies, Scientific and Agricultural papers, and others occupying particular spheres of usefulness. It is time to speak of certain unwelcome features of newspaper and magazine literature, and of acknowledged evils for which a remedy should be sought.

I. Of the political press generally, we have to complain:

1. That *unfair and often unscrupulous party advocacy* is still too much in vogue. We are not of those who think that, in this respect, "the former days were better than these." Quite the contrary. Our acquaintance with the newspaper literature of the

past has convinced us that we are not retrograding, but progressing in the right direction. There is less violence and more truthfulness on the part of partisan editors than formerly. This is not so much to the credit of the present time as to the discredit of past times; for every one at all conversant with the tone and spirit of political journals knows that they are horribly given to lying, and are disgustingly dishonest, especially in the heat of political contests. We are disposed to make a few honorable exceptions from this sweeping censure, but not many. He is a born fool who expects to obtain truthful information from most of our party papers. In the best of them, if there is not actual mendacity and brazen falsehood, there is at least a concealment of truth and a one-sided representation of facts and of characters, intended to mislead. Often, too, there is a degrading coarseness and abusiveness of style, altogether beneath the dignity of the true gentleman. The demoralizing effect of all this on the public mind is painfully apparent. With the progress of education and refinement let us hope that public sentiment will rebel against these abuses, and compel a reliance on nobler weapons of political warfare.

2. *There is an unworthy resort to sensationalism* for the sake of patronage. Since newspapers have come to depend on the sales of newsboys rather than on regular subscriptions, there is a strong temptation to make every paper salable by some rare attraction or startling novelty. It has, therefore, become an art to make the most of every thing, and furnish what will be sure to sell. This leads to a distortion of facts, to huge exaggerations of ordinary events, and to the employment of a set of literary scavengers who scrape the gutters of society and gather up from lanes and alleys wretched scraps of scandal and tokens of crime, until they groan beneath a burden of intelligence of reeking pollutions—assnations, riots, thefts, elopements, murders, suicides, etc., (all memory of which had better be dumped into the sea than paraded in the columns of daily news,) gallows-scenes, the brutal contests of the prize-ring in their most disgusting details, the minutæ of police-court trials, glowing descriptions of lascivious dances, exciting descriptions of the vile sensationalisms of a woefully degraded drama, (which every pure mind knows stood in no need of degradation,) horse-races, billiard contests; in a word, every thing that can minister to the love of the

marvelous, or the pruriency of a fun-loving and scandal-loving public, even if they have to descend into the depths of vulgarity and obscenity to furnish it.

The result of familiarizing the public mind with crime and folly is necessarily evil. Especially on the young does it exert a most demoralizing influence. There is a precocity of knowledge of the darker side of human nature, on the part of young America, that is often startling; and a degradation of taste, and a blunting of moral perceptions, and a destruction of tender sensibilities, that augurs unfavorably for a higher Christian civilization. Minds and hearts that daily gloat over the details of vice and crime in the columns of the morning or evening paper, will unquestionably incorporate into their own being that which they so eagerly devour, and it will result in—what? The conductors and patrons of papers should ponder this question seriously. We have before us now a copy of a Sunday morning paper—an influential journal, of large circulation, on the first page of which appear likenesses of three distinguished pugilists, with biographical sketches of these contemptible bullies. This is Sunday reading! This enters into Christian households, and is read by thousands of children before going to Sunday-school, and by their parents before going to Church! Hopeful training for spiritual aptitude!

Said a reporter for a daily newspaper, when complained to of some injustice done in a sensational report of a religious meeting: "Sir, this is not a religious paper; this is *hell on wheels*!" Yet this was a journal of respectability, sought after by Christian people, and by no means of an inferior type.

This catering to vulgar tastes, and ministering to unhallowed pruriency, may *pay*, in the mercenary sense of that word; we presume if it did not, it would not be resorted to. But that it is a disgrace to journalism, and an injury to public morals, is patent; and an enlightened sentiment should frown it down. As long as it pays it will be continued; and while we do not exonerate journalists from blame in the matter, we charge the heavier share of guilt to the public. The supply only equals the demand.

3. *Mercenary aims too entirely control Journalism.* In view of the capacities of the press to enlighten the public, and its power to control it, journalism, as a profession, should be based on the highest

literary excellence and the purest morals. We have no space to enlarge on this. We look for improvement, in this regard, as rapidly as journalism ripens into a complete system.

II. Our religious papers, while characterized by much ability, are not without fault. We are not disposed to be hypercritical. None but those who have had actual experience can begin to estimate the amount of brain-work and of drudgery, and the extent and variety of knowledge and of tact, necessary to furnish a religious weekly of even ordinary attractiveness. The highest order of excellence can only be reached when immensely large subscriptions allow of the employment of a suitable corps of writers, and admit of a proper division of labor. We do not speak unadvisedly when we give our opinion that no class of literary toilers in our land are more severely tasked, or kept under heavier or more constant strain, than the editors of our religious weeklies. They must know every thing, and do every thing: translate Hebrew into English, and promises to pay into cash; dig into Greek roots for their readers, and into their subscribers for money to keep the press running; be as pious as Thomas Aquinas, as literary as Voltaire or Gibbon, as poetical as Byron, and as acutely practical as Vanderbilt, or consent to be written down blockheads; furnish proofs for all their positions, and examine proofs and re-proofs from the printer; be grave and funny, dignified and sprightly, logical and rhetorical, profound and pithy; write elaborate leaders and spicy paragraphs; defend their sect and be catholic in spirit; flatter their friends and slash their enemies, and be candid and truthful; be true to conscience and hurt nobody's prejudices; revise correspondence, review books, answer scores of letters daily, condense the news, report the markets, talk to every one that comes into the office, trust subscribers, pay cash to the printers, and, by way of recreation, preach sermons, deliver lectures, and attend all public gatherings of interest to report proceedings. Nearly enough, is it not, to keep one busy? Our judgment is, in view of all we have learned of the burdens and perplexities of such a life—unavoidable until religious journalism is more completely organized—that the religious papers of this country are generally marvels of industry and of ability. We look to them with the greatest interest as the truest conservators of the highest interests of society, and rejoice in all the evidences that abound of their great influence for good.

But there are serious drawbacks on their usefulness.

1. *They are too numerous.* Local, sectional, and party interests multiply their number beyond the means of equipping them for effective service. They lack, therefore, oftentimes, the ripe scholarship, the mature thought, the elaborate argument, the careful criticism, the literary finish, and the completeness of information which ought to characterize them.

2. *They are too much the slaves of party.* They lack the manly independence which, in religious inquiry and investigation more than anywhere else, should be found, and the bold advocacy of truth, for the truth's sake, without which truth is dishonored and cast down. The tremulous avowal of the soul's convictions, the velvety rebuke of errors and sins yet sanctified in the prejudices of the age, the timid conservatism that fears man and fails to trust God, is not the offspring of a genuine faith, and—however cloaked in the guise of piety—fails to command the respect of the world or the enthusiasm of the Church. Then, there is an unfairness trenching on dishonesty in the mode of warfare which denominational journals employ. They are not just. Rarely can one of them be found whose rule is to allow both sides of a controversy to appear in its columns. Misrepresentations, ungenerous attacks, injurious statements, often appear, for which redress is sought in vain. Men who profess to fear God and love righteousness will carefully exclude the arguments of an adversary which are difficult to be handled, and ostentatiously parade his weak points, or garbled extracts from his stronger reasonings, to show how easily they may be overturned. Not unfrequently the most untruthful statements are made of the faith and practice of opposing parties, and persisted in, without an opportunity for correction. In fine, what we have said of the evils and disgraces of political warfare, is largely applicable to the partisan religious press. We rejoice to be able to say that the evil is abating, and we hope to see the time when a renovated Christian sentiment will forbid all low partisanship, and insist on courtesy and justice to all.

We have one paper which, as belonging to no class, and being a host in itself, deserves special notice: *The Independent*. It is generally regarded as a hybrid—a cross between the Church and the world, and wearing more of the likeness of the latter than of the former. "None but itself can be its parallel." Whatever may be said of its

doctrines, none can deny its eminent ability. It is, indeed, a marvel among newspapers for size, the variety of its contents, the ability of its original articles, and the dashing radicalism of its editorials. It is not our province to decide here on its orthodoxy; but we take leave to say that its idea of carrying what religion it has into every thing, is the true idea. The distinction generally made between *religious* and *secular* is most false and mischievous. A religion that does not preside over the wash-tub, and reign in the markets, and control the ballot, is not worth having.

We had intended a brief review of periodical literature, and a discussion of the present *status* of newspaper and periodical literature among the Disciples; but these must wait for a future number.

We trust that this paper will not only amuse the reader with some curious and interesting facts, to obtain which the writer's fingers have been sadly soiled with the dust and grime that had settled on long-neglected documents, but that it will tend to quicken the gratitude of Christian hearts for the unspeakable benefits of a free press, as well as to deepen the reader's sense of responsibility as to the use and encouragement of this mighty agent in its glorious mission of a world's regeneration.

In conclusion, let us say of newspapers and periodicals what Bartholin said of books: "Without them God is silent, Justice dormant, Physic at a stand, Letters dumb, and all things involved in Cimmerian darkness."

IV.—THE PAPACY AND CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

THE Roman Catholic Church, being a politico-ecclesiastical affair in purpose and organization, positively hates all civil governments over which she has no control. In fact, she has no very strong affection for those under her immediate supervision, only as they contribute to swell her assumptions and to protect and conserve her selfish interests. She glories in the stupidity of the State. She is versed in the occult art of administering narcotics to political vassals. It has been the business of her long career to manipulate the State and to suborn all civil functionaries. She knows very well that the freedom of the State means, in Papal parlance, the abolishment of the relation that subsists between Church and State. On the assumed principle of infallibility, Rome has ever sought to make the State the servitor of the basest purposes. It has not only been her cherished purpose to render the State brainless, and therefore incapable of cogitating, but even to eviscerate the resources of the State, and through that painful process render it a pitiful and helpless creature—a plastic piece of clay, to be molded into any shape the Papacy might desire.

Like a nightmare, she has superimposed herself upon the breathing bosom of the State, and earnestly and persistently has she endeavored to crush the body and bones of every civil government that has ever struggled for life and liberty. Wherever the State has fawned before the Mother of Harlots, and flattered her vain pretensions, and wherever the civil government has admitted her claims and priestly prerogatives, in every such place the said civil government, made as meek as a monk by abject submission, has been permitted to play second fiddle at the frightful fandango of the Pope. But let Poland, and Hungary, and Bohemia, and the Netherlands, and the Italian States—and lately Prussia, and Austria, and Spain—declare what their attempts to gain civil and social liberty have cost them—what sacrifices of dear life and treasure these States have made to obtain personal liberty: liberty to think, to reason, to seek pleasure, to enjoy rational life.

It has been the secret and sworn purpose of the Papacy to dampen the ardor and to paralyze the efforts of every State that has struck out for mental independence and civil liberty. And wherever independent States have attempted to legislate in behalf of the general welfare of the people, without discriminating between distinctive religions and different orders of faith, as in England and the United States, the Pope has been present, by Jesuitical maneuvering and priestly trickery, to complicate civil affairs, and, as far as possible, render them nugatory—to discourage the advocates of liberty, and to involve the machinery of government.

The Papacy prospers best where the thinking is done by the self-elect few, and where the mouths of the masses are hermetically sealed. General education is to her the pale harbinger of woe and dissolution. In free America her numbers would be depleted, and her power absorbed every day, were it not for the fact that the Romish Church is proportionately replenished at the same time by constant foreign emigration. Rome, it is true, educates; but it is in a straight and deep groove, admitting of no expansion, being insusceptible of any elevating power, and powerless to inspire with a holy and noble ambition. A despotism never educates; for despotism, historically speaking, means *stagnation and contraction*—not motion and enlargement. The education of Rome is in a straight line—not in a circle. She educates from one stand-point only. She positively refuses to survey and examine every question beyond the periphery of her own stereotyped system. Here, in the United States, she finds herself in extreme perplexity, because of the fact that she can not manipulate the civil powers as she would like, and because she can not compensate for the losses she has sustained in the Old World. She seizes, as with a dying grasp, the Common School system of our Republic, and hopes (but against hope) to throttle the Goddess of Liberty by demanding of the municipal powers her proportionate share of the school fund, that, by this mode of segregation, she may render despotism more despotic, and by means of which, if possible, to stay the progress of truth and reformation. She is unwilling to trust her subjects in the clear atmosphere of general enlightenment; and so suspicious is she of the fidelity of her adherents that she positively forbids them the privilege of general association with Protestants. She is consuming herself by her own fear. She seems

to recognize the metaphysical fact that her suppliant supporters are mentally imbecile ; that despotic rule and dogmatic theology unfits them to distinguish between truth and error ; that in consequence of their utter dependence on priests for guidance, and when beyond the reach of Rome's theological tentacles, apostasy from the Roman ranks is anticipated. In this view of the case, is it any wonder that she resorts to intrigue and duplicity, and that, in order to superinduce spiritual somnolency among her subjects, she daily feeds them on the medicine of mystical opiates ? for only by such artful means can she hope to retain her minions and consummate her arbitrary plans.

The paradise of Romanism has ever been found in the wild domains of black superstition, and in the blank regions of undeveloped intellect. Intellectual lassitude, spiritual torpidity, and social dissoluteness, have in all ages been the characteristic traits of her millennial fullness and fatness. She has only recognized literature when literature has been subsidized to the behests of her unrelenting will. She has only approbated physical progress when the developments of physical progress have contributed to swell her revenues and to expand her hungry exchequer. She has made demonstrations of beneficence and extended the bounds of her charities only in those latitudes where her converts have been compelled to swear eternal fidelity to the great Diana of despotism, and where they have solemnly sworn eternal hostility to every opposing power. Let the history of one thousand years of blood and martyrdom corroborate these allegations.

The relation which the Roman Pontiff has sustained to the secular powers, since the time when the civil powers sought to free themselves from all complicity with the Papal powers, and to divorce themselves from all sympathy in sacerdotal affairs, has been of such a character as to enlist, in the generations past, the attention of the best men and wisest philosophers, while, at the same time, the results and experiences growing out of that unhallowed relation have proved themselves highly instructive. All through the millennial days of Romanism the civil powers had no voice to speak, no rights to proclaim, no prerogatives to be proud of ; because all civil governments were betrayed into the hands of the crafty priesthood. But since the dawn of the great Reformation of the sixteenth century, in the midst of all the brave efforts the temporal powers have made to

detach themselves from an unnatural and unholy alliance, the Papacy has held on with the tenacity of desperation, and most reluctantly granted the struggling States the dearly-bought privilege of mental and political independence. During the last three hundred years the political powers of Europe have been trying to sever their connection with the hard grasp of tyrannical Rome. Most of the *concordats* made within three hundred years have been extorted from the different Popes by the pressing demands of the various State authorities. But the time draws near, if not already here, when there shall be no longer need of *concordats*—when State governments shall tell Rome, in emphatic terms, to attend to her own spiritual affairs, while they, on their part, will look after the political and physical welfare of the people.

Concordats had their origin as far back as the beginning of the 15th century. The term Concordat was first applied to the Convention made in 1418, between Pope Martin V, and the representatives of the German nation, and was called *Nounulla capitula concordata et ab utroque parte suscepta*. A concordat is of the nature of a treaty, but is usually restricted to a convention between the Roman Pontiff and any secular Roman Catholic government for the adjusting of ecclesiastical affairs. One of the most important of the earlier concordats is that of Worms, called also the Calixtine Concordat, made in 1122, between Calixtus II and Henry V, in order to put an end to the long contest on the subject of investiture, and which has been considered a fundamental ordinance in Germany. Most of the concordats have been extorted from the Popes by the different civil powers. This matter of investiture gave the Papal powers much concern. The Popes were far more concerned in the bestowment of temporal endowments than in putting on and walking in the garments of righteousness; much more interested in the reception of State benefices than by illustrating in their lives the beatitudes pronounced by the great Teacher upon the saints of God. With them the kingdom of God is food and drink—not righteousness and peace in the Holy Spirit. They have followed Christ for the loaves and fishes. They hunger after these more than after truth and love.

By the following restrictions, made at the Council of Constance, in 1418, it can readily be seen that a great reform was needed at the

Papal court. These restrictions were imposed on the Papacy in order to push back the priestly innovators to their own proper sphere. The State could no longer, with self-respect, bear the encroachments and indignities of that spiritual (?) despotism which clung to the body-politic like a blood-sucking leech. The incubus of the Church upon the State was so oppressive and tenacious that, instead of throwing off the burden in one generation, it has required the long labor of three centuries to dislodge the *couchant* monster; and even now, when this monster of iniquity finds itself disjointed from the body-politic, wounded and bleeding and paralyzed as the hideous thing is, it still attempts to crawl back to its depleted victim—the liberated State. In the Convention just referred to, when the Council of Constance urged a reformation of the Papal court, Martin V saw himself obliged to conclude the concordats of Constance with the German, the French, and the English nations. This, indeed, was a bitter pill. Chapter i restricts the number of cardinals, and makes provisions as to their character and mode of appointment. Chapter ii restricts the Papal reservations. Chapter iii treats of Papal annates and taxes, which for France were reduced for the space of five years to one half of their former amount; while in the English Concordat these were abolished altogether. Chapter iv defines what trials are to be lodged at Rome. Chapter v reduces the number of commandams. Chapter vi enjoins a strict proceeding against simony before the *forum conscientie*. Chapter vii provides that excommunicated persons need not be shunned before the publication of the ban. Chapter viii reduces the number of Papal dispensations. Chapter ix treats of the revenue of the Papal curia. Chapter x reduces for Germany the Papal indulgences, and repeals those that have been issued since the death of Gregory XI: in the French concordat nothing is said about this point. Chapter xi provides that the German and French concordats are to be valid only for five years, and that with regard to the French, the royal sanction is reserved.

This was driving the Papacy into close quarters, and extorting concessions from the cardinals which they were the least disposed to make. When it comes to the act of reducing the benefices, and of curtailing the annates, the Pope pules like a baby; and prelates lament more over the curtailment of State revenues and the abolishment of indulgences than they do over the increase of sin and the

demoralization of a nation. The fact is, it may be set down as an axiomatic truth, intensely verified by the bloody history of the past, that the Roman Church flourishes and extends her power in the inverse ratio of national degradation; and also that she declines in power and loses influence in the inverse ratio of spiritual enlightenment and the expansion of civil liberty.

In the *Concordat of Princes*, made and ratified at Frankfort, 1447, the German nation, through her chosen electors, draw the unwilling Papacy into many important concessions. The demands of these German princes chiefly concerned the recognition of the supreme authority of general councils in opposition to the supremacy of the Pope, the convocation of a new general council, and the redress of the grievances of the German nation—such as (1) liberty to administer the Eucharist in both kinds; (2) that all mortal sin, and especially open sin, should be repressed, corrected, and punished, according to God's law; (3) that the Word of God should be preached faithfully by the bishops, and by such deacons as were competent to fill the place; (4) that the clergy should not possess authority in temporal matters. Pope Eugene IV characteristically resisted these fair demands of the civil authorities throughout all the sessions of the Council of Basle; and not until he found himself prostrated on his bed of death did he finally yield to the German princes the privileges of untrammelled religion. The temporalities of the Pope constituted the bone of contention in this celebrated Council. On account of the reformatations that have, from time to time, sprung up in Germany, the Pope and his prelates have ever hated the Protestantism of Germany with a perfect hatred. In the case before us, the State demanded her temporal rights and civil privileges, as being fully competent to manage them; while at the same time the civil authorities were more than willing to accord to the Church the privilege of managing her spiritual affairs; but the Roman Church refused then, as she refuses now. But the beginning of her woes is upon her!

During the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, when there existed political chaos, and social disorder disturbed the counsels of princes, the Popes, as merely a temporary achievement, succeeded in concluding concordats very much to their advantage; because it is when temporal princes are at war with one another, when geographical

boundaries are to be settled, and when patriotism brings contending armies into hostile array, that spiritual despots gain strength and courage to consummate their nefarious plans. With an eagle eye the Papacy watches the advent of national weaknesses and social follies. Such was the case, when, in 1448, the Emperor Frederick III concluded (without the concurrence of the electors) with the Cardinal legate Carvajal a concordat at Vienna, which granted nearly every concession the Pope demanded: the most important of which concessions were, (1) the ratifying the election of all the Bishops, (2) of canceling ecumenical elections (such as were agreed to by the German princes in the previous concordat of 1446), and (3) of appointing bishops for the dioceses thus made vacant. This was called the *Vienna Concordat*. This and the *Frankfort Concordat* combined are called, in history, the *Concordats of the German Nation*.

In 1516, through the weakness and vacillation of King Francis I, Pope Leo X prevailed so far as to conclude a new concordat, which the Lateran Council, then in session, approved and embodied with its decree; while at the same time the king made it a law of the country, and that, too, in opposition to the protest of the Parliament of the University of Paris. This concordat established what, in the parlance of Popery, is termed the *annates*, referred the *causæ majoris* for adjudication to Rome, and gave to the king the right of nominating the bishops—three very important concessions, and especially the one that relates to the “annates” or first-fruits; for, according to the ecclesiastical law of these authorities, the Pope claimed the disposition of every spiritual benefice within the realms of Christendom, reserved out of every living. These *annates* were a very important consideration in the councils and kitchen of Leo X. It is presumed, also, that even Pius IX, at this epoch of time, as he views the absconding States of Italy, Prussia, Austria, and Spain, racing for life and liberty, hankers after the flesh-pots of the mediæval ages, that his hungry soul pants for the return of those lascivious days of fish and fowl, when all great cases of refractory princes, and all great cases of sacerdotal recusants, were referred to bloody and impious Rome for final adjustment, and when the king of the country could only nominate bishops as they were indicated by the sovereign pontiff.

The enslavement of the State by the so-called Church has been

the bane and the bitterness of all civil governments in the ages past. At this present time, both in Europe and America, the fiendish powers of Rome, by their silent Jesuitical propaganda, are about, in a desperate and final struggle, to attempt the bold and fearful work of undermining all free governments by overthrowing common school education, and by exalting denominationalism. And so well have they succeeded in this country that, on the question of segregating a special State fund for endowing Catholic schools, they have *Romanized* New York City and the New York Legislatures, and later still, they have been trying the same game in Cincinnati and other cities. Since the disestablishment of the Irish Church, but a few months since, Cardinal Cullen issued a pastoral letter in Ireland forbidding parents to send their children to the national model schools, on pain of deprivation of the sacraments. About the same time the Romish bishops assembled in Dublin, and adopted resolutions demanding an exclusive Romish endowment by the State, the division of the property of royal and endowed schools, the alteration of Queen's Colleges to denominational institutions, and a general land bill of Ireland. None but Romanists could make such modest requests. None but bad men and infidels could grant such requests. Between Romanists who would corrupt the State, and infidels who would exclude the Bible from our common schools, we must, as Christian freemen, have a fearful fight.

"In 1451 a concordat was concluded with the Duke of Savoy, by which the latter received the right of nominating for the most important benefices. In 1486 King John II, of Portugal, concluded a concordat with Pope Innocent VIII, by which he abandoned the *Placet Regium*, which the kings had exercised since the beginning of the century, though, since 1427, the Popes had protested against it. The concordat was disapproved by the Cortes. In 1523 Pope Adrian II gave to the King of Spain the same right as regards the nominating for ecclesiastical benefices which had been conceded to France. No concordat was concluded during the sixteenth century after the year 1523, and none at all during the seventeenth century."*

During the eighteenth century—from 1717 till 1774—five distinct concordats were agreed upon, all of which were occasioned chiefly by the revival of the anti-Papal tendencies of the Church of Rome, which had prevailed in the fifteenth century, and still more by the development of the theory of the absolute State; and which theory of the absoluteness of the State at the present time in the European States

* M'Clintock and Strong's *Cyclopedia*, vol. ii, C. D., p. 457.

is most likely to prove a grand realization. Investitures, benefices, annates, and all State endowments of Church institutions, together with all State patronage, must yet be removed by the unanimous voice of a liberated people, and Cæsar's kingdom shall stand apart from Christ's kingdom as in the days of the pure Primitive Church. Below we give a brief statement of the concordats of the eighteenth century, all of which belonged to the Latin nations of Europe:

"1. *Savoy*.—The arrangement of 1451 had been the subject of long controversies, which were partly settled by an agreement in 1727, and fully by a concordat on January 6, 1747, which made provisions on the admission and authority of Papal bulls in the country, on the limits of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, on the exemption of Church property, on the right of asylum, etc.

"2. *For Milan*, which, since 1706, belonged to Austria, a concordat was concluded December 10, 1757, concerning exclusively the exemption of Church property.

"3. In *Naples* the so-called *Monarchia Sicula*, or the right claimed by kings to act as Papal legates, had long been an hereditary subject of controversy between the secular governments and the Popes. It was finally regulated, together with other differences, by a treaty concluded June 2, 1741, which recognized, though in somewhat modified form, the exemption of Church property and the clergy from taxation, the right of asylum, ecclesiastical jurisdiction in marriage affairs, and the right of the Church to superintend the importation of foreign books.

"4. *Spain*.—The conflicts between Spain and the Pope concerning the extent of the royal right of collation were settled by a preliminary agreement in 1737, and by a concordat concluded January 11, 1753. An appendix to the concordat concerning the rights of the Papal nuncio in Madrid was agreed upon.

"5. *Portugal*.—In 1740, Benedict XIV granted to the kings of Portugal, by a concordat, the right of nominating for the Episcopal sees and all benefices."*

The subjection of Naples by Papal power is a well-known historical fact. For generations there had been a conflict between Church and State—between the secular powers and the Popes. What was called the *Monarchia Sicula*, or the right claimed by kings to act as Papal legates, as cited above, had given rise to the most virulent controversies. The right of the Papacy to institute a priestly *espionage* on the importation of books was a point gained of vast importance to them. The introduction of light might have exposed to view the ugly deformities of the dark despotism! This sort of low cunning and spiritual exclusiveness at once betrays the weakness of the internal machinery, and furnishes the tacit admission that the plans of the Romish propaganda can not bear the scrutiny of the

* M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopedia, vol ii, C. D., p. 457.

public eye. With respect to Naples, 200 years ago, all self-assertion of the State was crushed—all attempts, for the time being, to rise to political and spiritual independence were thwarted. The people were pitiful *lazaroni* in vassalage to the tyrant Church. Janus-faced and lynx-eyed, the Papal authorities watched the least encroachment of civil liberty, and all anti-Papal literature they stood ready to commit to the flames, well knowing that the introduction of Gospel light and religious literature would furnish the means of exposing the villainies and enormities of the Papal system. Even the ceremony of marriage, and all the domestic ties growing out of the marriage relation—the nearest, and dearest, and sweetest that belong to the human heart—must be brought under the surveillance of lecherous priests. The secrets of the human heart, the private thoughts of the husband—which must be divulged to the priest, but not to the wife, and the tenderest emotions of the wife's bosom—which must be known by the treacherous priest, but not by the husband—must be put in the safe-keeping of Mystic Babylon!

The concordats of the 19th century have been somewhat numerous, and involving principles of the highest importance. Many of them were produced through a desire of the European governments to rearrange ecclesiastical affairs, which had been precipitated into utter disorder by the French Revolution, and in consequence of the territorial changes that had been made by the revolutionists of those fearful times. In France, when Bonaparte was first Consul, he concluded a concordat with Pius VII, July 15, 1801, which went into operation the following year. This agreement re-established the Roman Catholic Church, which was then declared to be the religion of the majority of the French people, and which has become the basis of the present ecclesiastical constitution of the French nation. Among other things, it guaranteed to the Roman Catholic Church freedom and publicity of worship, which was, however, placed under the general laws of police. It promised a new circumscription of dioceses, and provided for all the bishops at that time in office. It granted to the First Consul the privilege of nominating the bishops, and prescribed the oath of allegiance to the secular power, which the bishops and the other priests were obliged to take. The bishops had the right to appoint the parish priests, but the priests so appointed must be in agreement with the State Government. Of the church

edifices not yet sold, as many as were necessary for divine worship were to be restored to the bishops. The Romish Church renounced all claims to the property that had been disposed of during the raging of the Revolution, and the State and municipal authorities agreed to pay the bishops and priests a sufficient salary. The former rights and prerogatives of the French crown were recognized as having been transferred to the first Consul, but in the event that a person, not a member of the Papal Church, should be invested with the high office of Consul, new provisions were reserved. This concordat was published as a law of France in 1802, together with some introductory "organic articles." But against these last, however, the Popes always and invariably protested. Several years later two other concordats were concluded by Bonaparte, but not of sufficient importance to merit any thing more than a simple allusion. Any one acquainted with the history of the French Revolution, and who has read the revolutionary proceedings of the First Consul, is apprised of the fact that Bonaparte had things his own way, and that it was his delight to toss bishops and priests and all Church officials about on the horns of his high ambition. He loved the bishops when they served his purposes; he hated them when they stood in the way of his military achievements. Not that he loved the bishops less, but himself a thousand times more.

"Louis XVIII concluded at Rome, with Pius VII (July 11, 1817), a new concordat, by which that of 1516, so injurious to the liberties of the Gallican Church, was again revived; the concordat of 1801 and the *articles organiques* of 1802 were abolished; the nation was subjected to an enormous tax by the demand of endowments for forty-two new metropolitan and Episcopal sees, with their chapters and seminaries; and free scope was afforded to the intolerance of the Roman Court by the indefinite language of article x, which speaks of measures against the prevailing obstacles to religion and the laws of the Church. This revival of old abuses, this provision for the luxury of numerous clerical dignitaries at the expense of the nation, could please only the ultra-royalist nobility, who saw in it the means of providing their sons with benefices. The nation received the concordat with almost universal disapprobation; voices of the greatest weight were raised against it; the Chambers rejected it, and it was never carried through. After the Revolution of 1830 the Government fell back on the concordat of 1801, and the organic articles became a new subject of controversy between Church and State."*

Rome delights in the false doctrine of *imperium in imperio*. But, philosophically, we know that no two bodies can occupy the same

* M'Clintock and Strong's Cyclopedia.

place at the same time. Neither can two political governments which in principle are antagonistic to each other. Much less can the government of Christ be identified with, and become a part of, any human government. There is a perfect incompatibility existing between them. The interference of the Church with the affairs of State, and *vice versa*, has, in all ages, been the prolific source of discontent and untold misery: the moving cause of nearly all political and religious anarchies from the time of Constantine the Great down to the present Pope of Rome. Let human governments receive all the moral power and spiritual light they possibly can from the Kingdom of Christ; but let not the political powers legislate for the Church, nor the Church impose statutory law upon human governments.

The dissolution of the German Empire, which disintegrated Germany, Prussia, and Austria, greatly disturbed the relation which subsisted between the Pope of Rome and the German Roman Catholics. The whole country was in utter and almost hopeless confusion. When the political reorganization of these several powers began, the Pope, by characteristic arrogance, at first demanded the restoration of the former entire state of things. But when the fact came to be known that such an arbitrary demand would never be granted, negotiations with particular States at once began, and, as a final result, concordats were concluded (1) with *Bavaria*, July 5, 1817, (2) with the Government of *Prussia*, in 1821, and (3) with the *Province of the Upper Rhine*. These concordats chiefly related to the establishment of archbishoprics, the endowment of seminaries, civil and religious jurisdiction, the payment of taxes, etc. But even as far down as the year 1867 there were continual clashings and misunderstandings between these spiritual and temporal powers, which, in the last two years, have culminated to the great disadvantage of the Imperial City.

In 1857 a concordat, consisting of thirteen articles, was concluded with the king of Würtemberg. Many of these articles the legislature never ratified, which ominous fact goes to show that the civil powers, by degrees, were dissolving their connection with the Papacy. The passage of some of these articles almost amounted to a sham—the playing of an ecclesiastical farce. In 1821 *Hanover* obtained some special privileges in favor of the Romish Church, but not of sufficient importance to be placed on record.

The Austrian Government began negotiations with the Pope soon after the beginning of the revolutionary movements of 1848—a powerful revolution yet fresh in the minds of many. A concordat was concluded in 1855, which granted about every demand the Papacy had made, so that, for the time being, the powers of Papal darkness were in the ascendant. Compared with what Austria now is, the following points made in that concordat will show to great disadvantage. These points will demonstrate that the Papal authorities demanded too much—mistook the signs of the times and the spirit of the age—and hence the reactionary movement of the people in 1867, and the abolishment of the concordat by the Austrian Parliament. Here are the articles of agreement alluded to:

“The Roman Catholic Church, in all parts of the empire, enjoys the protection of the Government. The *Placet Regium* is abolished, and the intercourse of the bishops with the Pope is free. The instruction of the Roman Catholic youth must be in accordance with the Roman Catholic religion. The bishops have the power to detain the faithful from reading pernicious books. Cases of the canon law, especially marriage affairs, belong to the ecclesiastical courts, while the civil relations of marriage remain under the jurisdiction of the secular judge. The bishops have the right of exercising the discipline of the Church, and of proceeding against members of the Church with ecclesiastical punishments. The power of the State is promised to the maintenance of the immunity of the Church. The Episcopal seminaries are under the jurisdiction of the bishops. The Emperor has the right of nominating the bishops, after taking counsel with the other bishops of the ecclesiastical province. The first dignity at every metropolitan and suffragan church is conferred by the Pope. The monastic orders are under the jurisdiction of their superiors. The bishops have the right of introducing new orders, after coming previously to an understanding with the Government. Church property may be acquired in the legal way, and is secured to the Church. In February, 1856, twenty ‘*Separat-Artikel*’ (separate articles) to the concordat were published. They provide that the bishops may found one University independent of the State; that the only Roman Catholic professors shall be appointed at the University of Pesth; that Church and State will work together for the suppression of books against religion and morals; that the State shall lay no obstacle in the way of erecting such confraternities and associations as the Church has approved; and that the bishops shall not be hindered from regulating in religious institutions every thing that concerns religion and the purity of the Christian life.”

Is it any thing remarkable that the Austrian people, in the full blaze of civil liberty and religious light, should become intensely indignant over the imposition of such a monstrous despotism? Austria has shaken off, we trust forever, the incubus of civil liberty. On the 25th of May, 1868, the Austrian Government, by a final and most significant decree, repealed this obnoxious concordat, made

purely in the interests of the Pope, and proclaimed the freedom of all Churches, and their entire exclusion from interference in purely secular matters. According to the provisions of this decree—a decree that has placed the Pope at his wit's end, and thrown his cardinals *hors de combat*—clerical jurisdiction in matrimonial matters is at an end, and in this respect, as well as in respect to other matters, the civil courts are to decide in harmony with the civil code. If any priest shall throw in the way of marriage obstacles not founded in the law, the parties can then, in such case, be legally married by the civil magistrates. Likewise, in all cases of separation and divorce henceforth to be consummated, it is the civil law that is to decide. The supreme direction in educational matters is to be exercised by the State. Religious education remains in the hands of the clergy of the various denominations. Public schools are open to all, without difference of religion. The members of one Church can not be forced, in any way, to contribute to the wants of another, unless such obligation is founded on patronage or private contract. The articles of the law by which apostates from Christianity are disinherited, as well as that by which the attempt to induce a Christian to change his religion is punished *as a crime*, are abolished. No religious community can refuse decent burial to persons of another religious faith in places where no burial-ground exists of that faith. These are the most important matters contained in this justly celebrated Austrian decree. The minor matters of the decree were these: In mixed marriages parents may agree about the religion of their children as they please; if there is no such agreement, the sons follow the religion of the father, the daughters that of the mother. Illegitimate children adopt that of the mother. After the fourteenth year of age, every one is free to change his religion, only certain formalities are to be observed. No one can be forced to abstain from work during the fête days of a religious faith not his own; but every one is obliged to abstain from whatever might interfere with the public worship of any religion.

This Austrian decree is a thorough evisceration of the Papal system. It threw the Pope into paroxysms of rage. For a time he alternated between desperate revenge and abject despondency. Finally, at a secret consistory, held on the 2d of June, 1868, the Pope delivered his Allocution—the most pitiful thing that any Pope ever

uttered—which he intended as a review of the legislative act abolishing the *Austrian Concordat*. Like a despot completely baffled and chagrined beyond measure, in his Allocution, addressing himself to the “Emperor and Apostolic king of Austria,” he implores, he threatens, he flatters, he grieves, he hopes, he cites history, he even falls to *reasoning*. But the reply of the Austrian Government, through her Minister of State, BEUST—a most able and eloquent State paper, and worthy of the attention of all reformers—gave the Pope his quietus. But Pius IX neither sleeps nor slumbers in perilous times, for he has issued a Bull of Convocation, in which he invites the whole world to come to Rome. In this famous Bull, appointing an Ecumenical Council to meet in the Imperial City, December, 1869, he expresses his paternal care over the entire human family, points out impending danger, indicates the great purpose of the council, shows what is the hope of the world, invites the Oriental Churches to come, invites the Protestant Churches to come, and promises a grand programme of performances. Austria, the “favorite son of the Church,” in the days of Rome’s highest prosperity, is now a *prodigal* son from the bosom of the Church: will he ever return?

A concordat was concluded between the Government of the Netherlands and the Pope, in 1827, but as its contents are not of general interest, we propose not to give the details. In 1818, in the city of Naples, a concordat was concluded for the benefit of the Italian States, consisting of thirty-five articles, guaranteeing to the Pope about all the claims he demanded; among which are found these: The Roman Catholic Church is declared to be the existing religion of the State; the right of acquiring new landed property; the jurisdiction of bishops is enlarged; the direction of public instruction is guaranteed; the property of the Church is declared inviolate; etc. A concordat for the benefit of the Roman Catholic Church of Russia was concluded by the Emperor Nicholas, August 15, 1847, which guaranteed to the Roman Catholics of that country the free exercise of their religion.

A concordat, consisting of fifteen articles, was concluded with the Government of Tuscany, June 19, 1851, which continued in force until 1859, when, by the absorption of Naples and Tuscany into the Empire of Italy, the special concordats were abolished. Some of the provisions of the concordat were to this effect: the ecclesiastical

authorities, in the exercises of their offices, shall have the protection of the State; the bishops shall exercise censorship over religious publications, and have the right of preventing the faithful from reading pernicious books; if priests offend against the civil laws, they shall be amenable to the civil courts, but the punishment shall not be inflicted without the consent of the bishops; and if it be the penalty of death, or any penalty involving infamy, the Papal See shall take cognizance of the case.

A concordat with Spain, embracing forty-five articles, was concluded March 16, 1851, which, considering what Spain is now, presented a savory dish for Popery. According to this concordat, it was decreed that the Roman Catholic religion, to the exclusion of every other, is the *only* religion of the Spanish people. Public instruction in all institutions of learning is to be imparted in strict agreement with the Roman Catholic doctrine, and this instruction to be directly under the control of the bishops. The Government binds itself to assist the bishops in maintaining the purity of doctrine and of morals, and in suppressing pernicious books—which “pernicious books” included King James’s version of the Bible, and all Protestant works. The female orders engaged in the office of educating in the Catholic doctrine, as well as the Sisters of Charity, must be maintained by the State.

A concordat was ratified by the Portuguese Legislature, in 1859, in reference to the present and former Portuguese possessions in India, and which places nearly the whole of British India under the jurisdiction of bishops appointed by the Government of Portugal.

The present Pope of Rome, in his Allocution to the Austrian Government, complains bitterly—“That law establishes free liberty for all opinions—liberty of the press, of all faith, and no matter what confession or doctrine; it grants to the members of every confession the right of establishing public schools and colleges, and members of every confession are allowed to be admitted on the same footing, with the sanction of the State.” The Pope says he “felt great grief on being informed” of the above facts. Is it any wonder? He is certainly in great need of sympathy. No doubt he will receive the commiseration of all despots. Misery loves company. But the Pope and his prelates must know that they can not with impunity run against the decrees of God. When men have once tasted of the

sweets of love and liberty, the doom of reigning despots only becomes a question of time, for God hears not in vain the cries of his oppressed people. God sees that the Papacy have been gloating over the spoils of a corrupt Church and disordered States long enough. The separation has come—the Church of Christ must stand out pure and undefiled, the Christianizing force of the world, while, at the same time, the State, as her own peculiar mission, must look after the physical and temporal wants of the world. The Pope must learn to know that he is freeman whom *the truth* makes free, and all the rest are slaves besides. If his majesty, the Pope, could know any thing of the workings of the moral government of God, he might realize that God makes the *wrath* of man to praise Him.

The Pope, in this same Allocution, utters a plaintive sigh over the fact that Austria "has promulgated a law on education which suppresses all the influence of the Church over education, decreeing that the whole superior supervision of education, literature, and science, as also the inspection of schools, appertains to the State, which finally decrees that religious teaching in the public schools must be placed in the hands of members of each separate confession; that any religious society may open private or special schools for the use of its faith; that those shall also be subject to the supreme inspection of the State, and that the school books shall be submitted to the approval of the civil authorities; with the exception, however, of such books as are meant for religious instruction, books which must be submitted to the approval of the competent authorities of each confession." These decrees of the Austrian Government the Papal Allocution pronounces "*abominable laws.*" Archbishop Purcell, in America, echoes the same sentiment, though he and his fellow prelates feign great love and abounding admiration for the civil institutions of free America. But in the above decrees, as quoted in the Allocution, is it not plain to be seen that the statesmen of the Austrian Government have apprehended the genius of Christianity; that they recognize the rights and common equality of all men; that by these legislative acts of theirs they tacitly admit the separating influences of the Gospel of Christ; that the principles of liberty and the right of private judgment, as enunciated and illustrated in the wide domains of the United States, have largely influenced the minds of those Eastern statesmen to move in the direction

of progress and emancipation. But it is just the kind of progress the Papal authorities intend neither to approve nor imitate. Free schools and common education they esteem as their mortal enemies—as the primal disturbing cause of all their Papal infelicities.

The Austrian Minister of State, BEUST, in responding to the lugubrious Allocution of Pius IX, thus, among other matters of high consideration, pronounces, in golden terms, the principles of enlightened statesmanship:

“But what we can not pass over without objection is the condemnation hurled against the fundamental laws on which the new institutions of the empire are based. These laws were not the subject of dispute, and by attacking them as it has, the Holy See deeply wounds the national feeling, and gives to the present difference a meaning that is very much to be regretted, even in the interest of the Church. Instead of simply contesting this or that application of the principles which form the basis of the present Government of Austria, and which are the fruit of the happy accord between the peoples of the empire and their sovereign, it is the principles themselves that are condemned. The Holy See thus extends its representation to objects which we can by no means admit to be within its authority. It evenoms a question which already produced only too much excitement by directing men's minds to matters where political will be associated with religious passions.”

This defining of principles, and according to Church and State their proper limits, are the very things the Papacy prefer not to hear. It has been their chosen prerogative throughout the long lapse of the dark ages to dictate to sovereigns and people, not to be dictated to by political reformers and by the chieftains of God's providential arrangement. While the Papal powers in the United States are sedulously seeking to advance their interests by taking possession of the weak and unguarded defenses of the United States Government, and by taking advantage of the inexcusable indifference of our self-satisfied people, we would graciously recommend our American municipalities and city corporations to take lessons and warning at the feet of Austrian and Spanish statesmen. Let them know that the price of liberty is eternal vigilance.

The attack by the Romanists on the Common School system of education seems to have been consentaneous in Great Britain and the United States. Cardinal Cullen, of the Roman Catholic Hierarchy of Ireland, gave notice, some time since, that he would *deprive of the sacraments of the Church all parents who should send their children to be taught in mixed model schools of Ireland*: all of which means, if

it be possible, as the very last resource of a forlorn hope, that the Papal Hierarchy will transmute the order of nature; that they will put a stop to all intellectual and spiritual development; that they will roll back the car of progress into the dark ages; that they will suppress all sighs for liberty, and torture every conscience with blind belief. These paroxysms of rage betray a weakness which they find impossible to conceal, and which, to the enlightened world, appear as the sure harbingers of a certain and positive dissolution. This Hierarchy drives straight at the vitals of national life, when, in the language of the *London Times*, "They demand that an end be put to Trinity College as a mixed place of education, and that its endowments be parceled out, and a proportionate share allotted to the foundation of a purely Roman Catholic College for the training of young men on purely Catholic principles." Now, is not that a modest demand? None but knaves or fools could make such a demand. But England laughs at such sacerdotal audacity. In a council at Baltimore, in 1866, the spiritual powers of Rome passed resolutions of condemnation against the Common School system of the United States, and, in fastidious words, demanded that the immaculate children of the Catholic faith be drawn away from the "wicked licentiousness" and foul contamination of Protestant children! How chaste and modest and pure-minded these pious bishops are getting to be! But this last strategic movement of the enemy of all righteousness will be thwarted in time by the quick movements of the indignant masses of our enlightened Republic. It is plain to be seen that all this pitiful maneuvering of the confused and outwitted priesthood gives evidence of the fact, that the Roman Catholic Hierarchy are unwilling to trust a comparison of their creed with other creeds; that on this account, as well as others, they can not save their children from apostasy when brought in contact with children who have enjoyed higher privileges. *They are now put to the straits to save what they have*; disintegration is what they are alarmed at more than at the destruction of the system itself. But what is the machine worth when there is no material to grind?

In the month of July, 1868, the Lutherans of the United German kingdom made a bold move to separate the Lutheran Churches from the supervision of the State Government. A convention of all the Lutheran Churches of Germany met at Hanover, and there organized

a powerful party, now known as the "United Evangelical Church," which has for its chief object the independency of the Churches, and a final withdrawal from the patronage of the civil Government. This convention was represented by some of the leading divines of Europe. We in America are by no means apprised of the mighty under-currents of revolution going on in Europe. This Lutheran movement is significant. The Spanish revolution amounts to a moral miracle. The Anglican Church gives evidence of speedy dissolution. The Gallican Church and the Greek Church have caught a sudden inspiration. Italy will soon surrender—*then the Pope will die!*

V.—SAUL OF TARSUS AND PAUL THE APOSTLE.

WHEN Saul of Tarsus became a convert to Christianity, through the miraculous appearance and the personal ministry of Jesus, at the very moment when he was "breathing out threatenings and slaughter" against the infant Church, he did not sink his identity and personality, nor become dispossessed of those qualities and characteristics which had already given him pre-eminent distinction as a man. In his conversion—and perhaps he is to us the noblest illustration and example of the sanctifying power of Divine grace, and of the thoroughness of personal consecration to Christ—in his conversion he was transferred soul, body, and spirit, with every attribute and native element and source of power, from the service of one master to the service of another. He became a convert. He was converted. The word converted represents, both doctrinally and practically, the kind and the extent of the great, the wonderful change which was accomplished in him. He was "renewed." He was "transformed," by the renewing of his "mind." His spirit was changed; his eyes were opened; new worlds, upper and nether, were disclosed to him; his horizon and confine of life were infinitely lifted; he was quickened and sanctified in his spiritual perceptions and conscience; life, duty, obligations, God, eternity, and truth, appeared to him in new and marvelous forms, hallowed

with a bright, strange, and all-commanding light. He received the will of Christ as his will ; and yielded himself to the power and direction of Divine grace to be led by it, as he had before been led by another and contrary spirit ; and thenceforward he was a new man, consecrated unto a new life. He who before hated and persecuted the Church of Christ, now loved it, and labored for it, and devoted himself to its advancement. He whom the Church feared, whose very name was a terror to them, and under whose power they expected to fall, and almost feared they should become extinct, was now welcomed and loved as the friend of the Christians, the protector and Apostle of the Church. He went over to Christ and to the Church without partialness and without fracture.

Whether we contemplate the history of Saul of Tarsus, or of Paul the Apostle to the Gentiles ; of the young man at whose feet and in whose care were laid the clothes of the men who stoned the first martyr, Stephen ; or of Paul, the aged, prematurely old with the care of all the Churches, yet still ever young with the Spirit, the living Spirit of Christ and of the Truth ; ready to lay the trophies of an earnest life of faith and duty, and to lay life itself at the feet of the blessed Savior, who by personal revelation called him to be an Apostle : whether we contemplate the one or the other, we contemplate a man of most wonderful wholeness and symmetry, marked with unusual self-strength, individuality, courage, perseverance, and zeal ; yet so as not to be above and beyond being an example, in these characteristics, to all who admire, and would imitate, his spirit.

Saul, the persecutor of the infant Church, and Paul, the Apostle of the Church, on whom devolved the care of all the Churches, are one and the same person. If we admit comparison or contrast at all, it will have reference not to the kind and degree of manhood, but rather to the development and direction of his manhood and life. In Scriptural phrase, susceptible of depths of spiritual meaning, Paul is the new man, and Saul is the old man. And herein is a great change, and mightily worked ; but really it is the same man, removed into a new and opposite sphere of life-view, and life-object, and life-development ; with new surroundings, new influences, new motives ; the same almost omnific enginery of man, wheeling and thundering in the opposite direction ; the same giant and indomitable man, still hewing his pathway through life, but now with the attractions of the third heav-

ens full upon his large, open eye, and the blessed love of his crucified Master and Savior nestling warm and glowing in his great human heart.

Early one morning a company of travelers might be seen passing out of the city of Jerusalem, through the gate which was then called the gate of Ephraim, or Benjamin, one of the gates of the north, and now called the Damascus gate. Who or what this company is composed of you have no means definitely to determine. A soldier or two, perhaps; may be a priest also, judging by his face and his dress; and a scribe, with his ink-horn by his side; and for the rest, some turbulent, seemingly discontented, yet care-for-nothing looking men, going, they know not where; to do, they know not what; hirelings, to go where they are sent, or to do what they are bidden, and then receive their pay. But there is one who walks apart from the rest; apparently the youngest man of the company, upon whom the others seem to be dependent, to whom they turn their eyes, whose movements seem to govern theirs, and from whose presence with them they seem to derive, as a company, all their character.

As they pass out of the gate, and leave the walls of the city behind them, this young man turns to look upon the city—the Holy City! The scene, in his eye, is of wondrous beauty. Above the battlements and towers, and boldly relieved by the mountains beyond, the Temple rises from Moriah, more beautiful and sacredly suggestive than ever before, as it reposes in the morning sun, with serene glory, as if God were smiling upon it; and overlooking the palms, and the cedars, and the olive trees, and the groves of Kedron, and the thick, shadowy foliage of Gethsemane, and the tombs of the kings, and the sepulchers of the prophets, and the vineyards of the Princes of Judah, and the gardens of the Children of the Kings! He looks upon the city and the Temple with a steadfast and solemn eye. His countenance is firm of purpose, yet over-lighted with the serenity of devotion, as if he would say, with all the national and religious fervor, though not with the Divine spiritual illumination and prophetic forecast of David, “My feet shall stand within thy gates, O Jerusalem.” As he turned away from the city, and set his face toward the North country, there lay, stretched out before him, the land between the Valley of the Jordan and the Mediterranean Sea, through whose vales, and over whose plains and mountains, Joshua and Saul and David had pursued and smitten the enemies of Israel, and drove

them out from the land which the Lord had given to the chosen tribes for their inheritance. As he looked over the land, and recalled the grand old histories, and the traditions of the tribes, you might have heard him chanting, in the solemn Hebrew tongue, some strains of that majestic *Laus Deo* of David, preserved to us in the one hundred and thirty-sixth Psalm: "To Him who led his people through the wilderness; for his mercy endureth forever: to him who smote great kings; for his mercy endureth forever: and slew famous kings; for his mercy endureth forever: Sihon, King of the Amorites; for his mercy endureth forever: and Og, King of Bashan; for his mercy endureth forever: and gave their land for an heritage; for his mercy endureth forever."

Looking upon this young man as he journeyed along, you would have said of him: "Whatever business he has set out upon, he will accomplish it; and nothing shall hinder him save a blinding light from heaven, and the very voice of God himself. Heaven itself must open on his path, and God hedge up his way." For his countenance and whole bearing indicate to you three things: first, a conscientious and determined purpose; second, motives drawn from the very wells of a deep, religious nature, and made all-powerful to sway him by the sanctions of a thorough and stern religious education; third, authority; and that, too, drawn from the highest and most solemn tribunal he could recognize. It was this same man who afterward said, "I verily thought within myself that I ought to do many things contrary to the name of Jesus of Nazareth; which things I also did." And it was this same man, who, afterward, writing to the Philippians, said, "This one thing I do."

The point from which we are now viewing him, represents him to us as having had, at two entirely distinct periods of his life, two entirely distinct objects of life—one object for each period; and the change in the objects of his life marks and forever separates the periods, one from the other. The one period embraces his history from his entrance into public life to the time of his conversion to Christ. The other period embraces his history from his conversion to Christ to his martyrdom in the service and for the name of Christ. The object of his life during the first period was the extermination of the Christian Church and faith; the object of his life during the second period was the rooting and spread of the faith, the establishment

and glory of the Church, and the dominion of the name of Christ over the whole earth. To each of these periods in their course, and to the objects which they embrace, this man devoted himself; not a part of himself, but himself; with a thorough and an enthusiastic consecration. Singleness of purpose: this, humanly speaking, was the plane of his development, and the secret and measure of his success. If you observe him in any place; if you regard him in any position; if you scan him under any circumstances—though the most versatile, rapid, and apt of men—yet you find him the most prompt, the most accurate, the most decisive, the most determined of men; prompt, without abruptness; accurate, without management or littleness of calculation; decisive, without dogmatism; determined, without prejudice. View him as an Apostle: he has but one object of life; and to that object he is entirely consecrated. It is the object of his life. Not imposed upon him, and therefore a burden to him, but lovingly accepted, and inwoven with the web of his being, with the very texture of his breath and soul. He lives in the object of his life, and that object lives and has reality in him. In a reverent sense, he is master of it; and in that greatest of relations to it, of master, he serves it. He knows where the object of his life, as an end, lays; he knows the paths which lead to it, rosy with successes which others' eyes may not see; he knows the helps, the hinderances, the sufferings, the joys to be embraced and encountered, in pursuing the paths, and in compassing the object before him; and, therefore, he is never surprised by any circumstances, or unprepared for any events. In the most trying, perplexing, and humbling positions, he moves among them like one familiar with them, expectant of them, master of them. And in no position, and under no circumstances, does he say, "What shall I do?" But always his calm utterance, which inspires timid friends with courage, and overawes the cunning, craft, and malice of his enemies, is, "This one thing I do." His life, in this respect, presents to us for contemplation two sublime and unceasing wonders: first, that one man should have encountered and endured what he did; and second, that he should have encountered and endured as he did. The secret of it all is his singleness of purpose. He loses sight of his object—no, not for a single moment. He bends to his tasks, and marches to the object of his life, through the plaudits of admiring and loving friends; and through the crowds

of riotous enemies ; and through the gantlet of the scourge and the stocks ; and through the glooms of prisons, and the vapors of dungeons ; and through the ignominy of stripes and chains ; and through judgment forums, and kings' palaces, and most august tribunals ; often setting his life as a stake upon the mere hazard of his presence, or a single word from his lips ; as a stake against thrones, and kingdoms, and crowns ; and winning with the sureness of inspiration ; and came at last to the end of his journey, and embraced the object of his life at the block of the executioner. The tumultuous crowd around the scaffold, the gory block, the waiting edge of the newly sharpened sword in the hand of the strong and grim soldier, these he saw with his mortal eyes, because they were before him. But the chained and doomed prisoner there met One, unseen by all other eyes—the Object of his life—in angel, glowing form. Strange guest-chamber ! and strangely appointed and furnished ! He who, to all others' view, was a chained and condemned prisoner, was really and consciously the guest of angels and archangels, of cherubim and seraphim, of God and of Christ, of Prophets and of martyrs, expanding in unutterable glory, and filling all the lay of the land, and crowding all the lift of the sky, with their thronging and overhanging presence. And that scaffold became a throne, and that block grew into a chariot, and those chains became beautiful as the golden bands of the victor, and the victor-prisoner became an elect saint, a crowned and an everlasting prince !

Now, though God, if it were a question of power only, could have made an Apostle out of one of the most ignorant of the mad zealots who accompanied Saul on his way to Damascus, or out of the most weak and ignorant man that lived in Jerusalem, or even out of a stone in the highway, inasmuch as He was able, out of the stones at the feet of John the Baptist, to raise up children unto Abraham, yet His purpose was to select Saul of Tarsus for an Apostle, for the reason that Saul had in him, and native to him, those elements of being and characteristics, needing only the grace of God to sanctify and direct them, which eminently fitted him for an Apostle and servant of Jesus and the Church. And as an artisan, in the manufacture of any article of use, especially observes a fitness in the material employed for the use designed, whether it be of gold, or silver, or brass, or iron, or stone, or wood—so God, in his ordinary

election of men for service in the cause and kingdom of Jesus Christ, has respect to a certain fitness and eligibility in the men themselves for the work. His election of them is based in this elemental and characteristic fitness in them; and what remains is for them to be Divinely qualified, and then they are sent forth into the service of God. Men can do nothing for God without God, and God does very little for men without the men themselves. Reverently, God needs men; by them he works; through them he brings to pass his most wonderful and secret counsels; and without men very little transpires in this great world and day-time of events. In all ages, and for all his purposes and work, God is looking for men; and out of the masses his eye discerns, and his will calls, the man, the men, who are built up and ready for the work, when he bids them go. Not blindly does God call and send men out into his grand work-sphere. Nor does God send every one who says—send me. We have indulged the notion that the miracle-work of God's selection of men for his service consisted in the fact of his selection of notoriously unfit men, and their miraculous endowment for the work. Not so. The miracle is in this: that the selection is that of exactly the right man, though of all men he would have been the last one that men would have selected. The whole secret is told us by the Lord, when he said to Samuel: "For the Lord seeth not as man seeth; for man looketh on the outward appearance, but the Lord looketh on the heart." David was not a promising subject for King of Israel; nor Samuel the Prophet, nor Jesse the father, would have selected him; but the Lord selected him for Samuel's anointing, for David was the right man. The miracle of God consists in his seeing and selecting and anointing the right man to his work.

We have been accustomed to underrate the elemental ability and the native characters of the first disciples and Apostles of Christ, and to attribute their selection from among the people, and their appointment to the work of Apostles, as arbitrary, and without any reference to the men themselves—mere miracle-work, which, while presenting all the conditions of power, would not present the conditions of necessity and fitness, and would, therefore, lack the condition of wisdom. We have seemed to admire and wonder at the power of God in selecting unfit men for his work and making them fit, rather than admire and wonder at the wisdom of God in selecting fit men,

and sealing their commission with the word of his authority. We should regard these men as chosen in Infinite wisdom, and by Infinite foresight of a certain and real fitness in the men themselves for the work unto which they were called and appointed. Hence it was one man, and not another. Hence it was Matthew, and not Zaccheus; hence it was Simon Peter, and not Simon the Pharisee. And though these men essentially differed from each other, yet in each there were elements and characteristics which rendered him peculiarly adapted to the work to which the Savior called him.

No two men could present more striking points of difference, when compared with each other, than do Peter and John, as they are presented to our minds in the Gospels, in the Acts of the Apostles, and in their Apostolic Epistles. And a painter who should embody on the canvas his conceptions of these two men, after becoming absorbed with their history as recorded in the Scriptures, would present to us, in fair picturing of his just ideal, men differing entirely from each other in physical, and intellectual, and spiritual expression.

Peter would present a rugged and robust frame; an open, frank, honest, matter-of-fact intelligence; a generous, hopeful, trustful, confiding, earnest, spiritual texture. The whole aspect would be that of a strong, yet gentle, rough, but deeply and powerfully sympathetic man; overrunning with kindnesses, as some rocks are with delicate vine and flower growths, and which have cool fountain waters in their hard, rough, deep bosoms; as full of tears as of fire; as easy of flowing as of flashing; looking with a kind eye upon poor beginnings, and defects, and failures, where others would censure; a man whom you would love to have near you, and whom you would trust at a distance; a man whose good would have an enduring flavor of grace, and whose wrong would have more of reason in it, and for it, than other men's, only to be followed by a speedier and bitterer repentance.

John would appear of delicate and softly physical texture, whose strength is elsewhere than in his bone, and muscle, and blood; of an inquiring, philosophic, introspective, intuitional, deep-insighted and prescient intelligence; of a retiring, thoughtful, meditative spirit, habitually bordering upon and glimpsing the realm of inspiration and vision; not unsympathetic as toward men, yet loving as toward

principles ; severely pronounced in his loving faith as toward principles ; steadfast and uncompromising before no matter whom, in the presence of no matter what ; yet without any physical vehemence, gentle and unresisting. You would see at a single glance that he was the "beloved Disciple ;" beloved for what he was, and for the unspeakable possibilities of his susceptible spiritual life ; you would see that he was just the one of all the rest of the Disciples to lean on the Savior's breast at supper-time, and the others not envious of him ; just the one who, of all the rest, as he leaned on the Savior's breast, should ask him who it was that should betray him, while all the rest asked him, "Lord, is it I?" Why should they all say, "Lord, is it I?" while John only should say, "Lord, who is it?"

You glance at these two pictures. You love Peter, and you can not but love him. You love John also, and can not but love him. But you would approach Peter with familiarity, and tell him every thing, assured that he will gladly sympathize with you, and never betray you. But you would approach John with caution, with a quieter descent upon him, with a profound and reticent respect ; timidly intruding upon his meditations, and hesitating to burden and sadden him with your sorrows and faults. Peter was just the man on whom to build the Church ; and John was just the man to discuss with the schools and with the world the questions and mysteries of the "Logos," and to live in exile in Patmos, radiant and spiritually blooming as in transfiguration, and see visions of ineffable glory every day, and send down to the Church to the end of time, on the torrent of his inspiration, the "Revelation of Jesus Christ." You would see, also, that these men were defective, if you were disposed to look for that. You would observe in Peter strong prejudices, the fruit of his strong, robust, matter-of-fact nature. You would also see the weakness of a yielding, somewhat-easy-to-be-persuaded disposition, the fruit of his impulsive, generous sympathy, and unguarded, unsuspecting benevolence, and hopeful spirit. He will not betray you, no, never ; he may deny you ; and if he should deny you, he will suffer more in it than you possibly can by it : not the suffering of remorse, but of deep, genuine sorrow—true repentance—leading him to a frank, full, and tearful confession.

And you would see in John somewhat of dogmatism ; he would hear skeptics reason, but heretics should hold their peace ; he was

strong in opinion; inclined to be arbitrary, peremptory; impatient of any real or supposed check, or criticism; restive, if called in question; easily wounded, because of his nervous and delicately woven sensibility; altogether too delicate and sensitive for Peter's hard work, and for the common shuffle of life. You would misunderstand him in a first interview with him, and when you should come to know him, he would always appear an unsolved, ever-solving problem of spiritual life, clear as crystal, profound as the heavens.

You would see that Peter was just the man to die for his Master, the death of crucifixion; but, and we hope the legend is true, joyfully choosing in bold, yet sorrowful remembrance of his denial of Jesus, and in honor of his Master, to be crucified with his head downward; and that John was just the man of all the Apostles to escape martyrdom, after encountering its perils, and to die a natural death.

But Jesus selected these men for his Disciples, just as they were, and just for what they were. They were able to do what, in his infinite wisdom and foresight, no others could do as well as they. Hence he chose them rather than others. Mighty men they were. Mighty men they were in themselves. Weak, as compared with the work to which they were called, and sent; but still, as men, they were mighty. "Weak things of the world," they were called; but filled with the word and spirit of Christ, they confounded the mighty; "foolish things of the world," they were called, but they confounded the wise. They were glorious men; and the solemn and august satire of Paul in his Epistle to the Corinthians—first Epistle, first chapter—enthrones them above, far above the principalities and powers of worldly wisdom, and before their presence all philosophy and science, however grandly personified, fades into weakness and gloom.

So, in the intercepting of Saul of Tarsus, the Persecutor, when on his way to Damascus, in his conversion to Christianity, in his call and consecration to the office and work of an Apostle, there was Divine reference had to the character and quality of the man himself. Had God taken an altogether unfit man, and miraculously endowed him for the work of an Apostle, it would not have been so marvelous a miracle as is displayed in this selection of a man so fit, so qualified, and yet so apparently disqualified for it. Just at

that juncture of the Church, and in that strait of the truth, Saul was the best, and the only man. While he was one of the best examples of doctrinal and traditional and political and social Judaism, yet he had a wholeness, and strength, and nobility of nature and character, and comprehensiveness of manhood, which, enlightened with regard to Judaism and Christianity, and converted from the service of the one to the service of the other, would make him just what the Church most needed, and just what Judaism most dreaded. He was true as a Jew, and faithful as a persecutor. His unfettered and unwavering nerve-force was integrity; his convictions marshaled him the way he should go; every persecuting journey and deed of his witnessed for his conscience.

He became the chief of the Apostles; and upon him more than upon any other human instrumentality did the Church depend for its defense and its growth. And that not because of any special grace imparted to him, and withheld from the others, but because there was more of him; his measure was larger; his manhood was more massive and complete; the forces which were in him were of rare combination, and were susceptible of development and application on a grander scale. And when he received the gift of the Holy Spirit, he was thoroughly and marvelously furnished unto the work of an Apostle. Yet it may be said, with entire consistency, that Divine grace did more in him and for him than it did for any of the Apostles besides; and with equal truth it may be said, that not one of them did as much for Christ as did the Apostle Paul. He says to the Corinthians: "By the grace of God I am what I am." That was truly said. But he also said, and with equal force of truth, "I labored more abundantly than they all."

Now, it would be far more difficult for an artist, or for a word-painter, to present any thing like a complete representation of Paul, than to present a portraiture of any other one of the Apostles; for the reason that there is such a roundness and completeness of character in him; such an accordancy and unity of being; such a massiveness of structure; such ascendancy of reason and conscience and soul; such nice and delicate adjustment of self, and life, and character; such combinations and shadings into each other of traits, and dispositions, and characteristics—that, as a whole, he is practically immeasurable, and even inconceivable. He eludes the grasp of our

conception even while we gaze upon him the most intently. He grows upon us as we look, and soon reaches beyond and above us.

Of Peter, an artist would predicate largeness; of John, delicateness. But the difficulty in conceiving of Paul, or of embodying our conception of him in a figure representation, would arise from the fact that our impressions concerning him would seem to be separated from, and independent of, form and figure. He might be of large or of small stature; of handsome or of uncouth presence; but an artist's impressions of Paul would be aside from all physical considerations. Instead of impressions of largeness, as of Peter; and of delicateness, as of John, there would be the impression of greatness. This is unrepresentable and indescribable; yet we have sometimes had impressions kindred to this, in the presence of some men, when stature and form were lost sight of in view of a certain massiveness of being in them. When Daniel Webster was once walking the streets of London, it was Sydney Smith, we believe, who, approaching the American Minister, fixed his eyes on him as he came nearer, and still kept them fixed on him as they passed each other, and when they passed he still, turning his face after him, kept his eyes fixed on him; and when told by his companion that that man was Daniel Webster, the American Minister plenipotentiary, he replied: "He looks like a cathedral." A much larger man than Webster might have passed by without attracting the notice of the great political economist. It was greatness he was looking at, not largeness. A man might stand before you equal in height and breadth to Saul, King of Israel, head and shoulders above all the people, and yet the impression he would make upon you would be fully conveyed in inches; while a small man might stand before you, and the impression his presence would convey would be that of greatness, which you would feel rather than see, but which you could not adequately convey to another.

But rising above this, into a higher and nobler sphere of illustration: I remember to have read a description of the person of Christ, purporting to have been written by an eye-witness, in a letter to a friend; a description of the person of Jesus, his complexion, and features, and stature, and form, which could easily have been given by any one who had seen him. But, strangely enough, such a description was not attempted by any of the Evangelists or Apostles.

And the description to which I refer contained a reference to the presence of the Savior, as being indescribable and utterly without comparison. Accompanying this description was the statement that no portrait, or image, or die, or artistic representation of any kind, even in an age distinguished above all others for its liberal and cultured art, had been made of Jesus, the most marvelous personage who had ever appeared on the earth by all contemporary testimony. Now, we wonder at this when we think of the fact. Still, as we think of it, we find reasons for it, in part at least. We can not fail to see that it would be beyond the possibility of the most highly cultured and subtle art to represent a being whose countenance was more marred than that of any man, and who, at the same time, was the chief among ten thousand, and altogether lovely; to represent a person of whom it was said: "When ye shall see him, there is no beauty in him, that ye should desire him;" yet after whom all Judea went out, charmed by his presence.

You have seen West's celebrated painting of "Christ Healing the Sick." In this picture, though Christ is the central figure, yet it is not a picture of Christ, but a representation of the act of healing the sick. Still Christ is the figure which most attracts you, and that is what the artist intended. You are looking upon the sick ones painted with such wonderful skill and truth. Some are helplessly reclining in the arms of their friends; others are prostrate on the ground, as if dying; others are being borne to Jesus in the arms of strong men; women with their sick children are pressing their way through the crowd; the blind are seen, led along by some careful hand, or are groping their own way; the paralytic and the palsied are trying to get nearer to him; the demoniac is guarded and held by his friends. And then you are looking at the healthy and happy countenances of the healed; at the varied but marked and expressive countenances of the Disciples; at the malign faces of the consulting priests; at the incredulous but dignified Roman soldier; at the mute wonder and staring curiosity of the people; all this is distinctly and marvelously represented. The maimed, and the blind, and the deaf and dumb, and the demoniac, you readily distinguish; and for the sick ones, you are almost certain of the nature and stage of the disease. You feel what the priests are thinking about, and you can almost repeat their secret conversation. Now, while the best

endeavor of the artist has been employed to express power, conscious power, benevolence, and sympathy in the Savior who stands, the central figure, yet it is evident that the artist depends more upon the spectator for the success of his picture than upon his pencil. The intelligent spectator invests the Savior with what the artist could not express, but only faintly suggest.

And so have I seen the equally celebrated painting—"The Rejection of Christ:" the artist seizing upon that point of time in the persecution of the Savior, when Pilate says to the people, "Whom will ye that I release unto you, Barabbas, or Jesus which is called Christ? Then cried they all, saying, Not this man, but Barabbas." In this picture it is the act, the *tout ensemble* of the "Rejection," which is represented. Pilate, and the High Priest, and the false witnesses, and the hard-featured man with the corded whip in his hand awaiting the order to scourge Jesus, and the blind and raging rabble, are pictured. These are all presented in faithful and expressive portraiture. But Jesus is the central figure. He stands with bound hands, and with bowed head; with suffering, and patience, and meekness, rather intimated than expressed in his countenance—the artist evidently intending that the spectator, familiar with the history of the event, should invest the Savior with his own conception of the immeasurable endurance, and patience, and meekness, and forbearance of the suffering, the rejected One. The perfume of the rose can not be painted on the canvas; nor can the perfection of the diamond be sculptured in marble. Greatness is that which you feel, not that which you see; and where you most easily and most deeply feel it, it is most unutterable. The presence of the Infinite One is what we overwhelmingly feel, when by thought, or picture, or marble, or music, or word Divine, we see, by whatever faint and brief glimpsing, the Son of God!

And so, though we descend from the greater to the less, Paul can not be represented. He is one of humanity's monuments, if not the greatest and most beautiful. His recorded history in the Acts of the Apostles, and his Epistles to the Churches—even by these we can not measure him—and yet no man has ever had such a record as that. Still, that record falls short of him, grand as it is; for every page of the world's history since his day, and of its advancing civilization, records his name, and hints the greatness of his life.

His name and his life-work dignify and ennoble our humanity incomparably beyond any assembly of living men, or the work and worth of any existing human institution. Look at his record, from the moment when he cried, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?" to the time when he wrote to Timothy, "I am now ready to be offered, and the time of my departure is at hand: I have fought a good fight, I have finished my course, I have kept the faith;" and the world can produce nothing comparable with it. And for the reason, that while the grace of God did more in him and for him than it did for any of the Apostles, or for any man, living or dead, beside, it was because there was more in him, and more of him, as a man, as a character, as a life. He was a man to begin with. There was something to make something of. The greater Apostle was made of the greater man. The infinite Christ was grafted into an immeasurable man. With all reverence of thought, it seems another Incarnation!

Now, who and what was this Saul, afterward called Paul, an Apostle and servant of Jesus Christ? Saul has a history recorded in the New Testament, and prior to his record as an Apostle. He is first mentioned as guarding the clothes of the men who stoned Stephen, and as consenting to the death of the first martyr. He is next spoken of as making "havoc of the Church." The next time he is mentioned, it is said that he was "breathing out threatenings and slaughter against the Disciples of the Lord;" and desiring of the High-Priest letters to Damascus, to persecute the Christians he might find there in the Synagogues, and bring them bound unto Jerusalem. While engaged in this commission he was met in the way by Jesus himself, and by the personal ministry of Jesus he was converted to the new and despised and persecuted faith. The next that we know of him is, he was in the city of Damascus, in the street which is called Straight, and in the house of Judas, praying.

From the accounts given us by St. Luke, in the Acts of the Apostles, of Saul of Tarsus, we learn that he was a young man; that he was a member of the Sanhedrim; that he was the leader and chief of the persecutors of the Church; and from the death of Stephen, to the moment of his conversion, was consecrated to the work of exterminating the Christian Church. Not only was he "exceedingly mad against" the Christians, but the testimony is that his voice was potential in the councils of the Sanhedrim. The words, "And Saul

was consenting unto his death," when Stephen was devoted to martyrdom, would indicate that probably, upon the consent of Saul, the death of Stephen would turn. The Sanhedrim had no such terrors for the Church as the name of Saul of Tarsus. Humanly speaking, the entire Church stood in fear of him; and to all human appearances, he would soon rid the world of the new heresy. It was not the Jewish religion that made the infant Church to tremble; it was not the power and jealousy of the priesthood that inspired terror in Christian bands and communities; it was not the Sanhedrim that scattered and peeled the disciples; but it was Saul, the young man. It was Saul of Tarsus who consented to the death of Stephen; it was Saul of Tarsus who made havoc of the Church; it was Saul of Tarsus who breathed out threatening and slaughter against the Disciples of the Lord; it was Saul of Tarsus who, by merely asking, could receive letters from the High-Priest to go to the Syrian capital, and bind the Christians there, and bring them to Jerusalem. Paul says, in his address before Agrippa: "And when they were put to death, I gave my voice against them;" taking upon himself, in sorrowful affirmations of his power, the blood of the Christians. Now take into the account that Saul was not a hired man, to do the bidding and the work of his masters; that he was actuated by motives as deep as his unfathomable nature, inspired and cemented by the most rigid and thorough education, and the severest self-discipline; that the opposition to the Christian Church and faith was not the sudden and unmeaning excitement of a rabble and mob, but was the battle-array of all the traditions, and philosophies, and religions, and systems, and powers of the world against the system of the Cross; and that Saul of Tarsus was the very head and front, the concentration and master-spirit of the opposition, by whom the bewildering and killing blows of the assault were to be dealt; and that the question to be solved in the decisive battle was, shall Christ go down, or Saul of Tarsus go down? Take all these things into account, and we get some glimmer of idea as to who and what this Saul of Tarsus was, afterward, Paul, called to be an Apostle. The decisive battle came on the plain between Jerusalem and Damascus; and it was a personal conflict between Jesus and Saul. And the defeat of Saul, even more than victory, had that been possible, reveals to us the intellectual majesty and the moral might of the man. It was the sudden,

flashing, blinding light from heaven, at mid-day, shining above the brightness of the sun, that overcame and prostrated him; but it was not that that conquered him. That which conquered him, not as a terrified and trembling slave, but as a loyal, loving, and devoted adherent, was the personal revelation of Jesus himself, pleading the all-expostulating question, "Saul, Saul, why persecutest thou me?" This question, in the terms of it, is Divinely significant of who and what Saul was; and if any thing can still further disclose him to us, it is his answer to the question, "Lord, what wilt thou have me to do?"

The Church has never had such an adversary as was Saul of Tarsus; nor has it ever had such an advocate and champion as Paul, called to be an Apostle.

Do you wonder at the change? It is the miracle of persuasive, convincing, consecrating Truth. In what is Saul changed? He is changed in all except himself. The old spirit that usurped him was cast out, and the spirit of Truth and of Christ possessed and sanctified and controlled him.

He who fell before the heavenly light, a persecutor, and he who stood up an Apostle, at the voice of Jesus are one and the same person. He who in Jerusalem had breathed out threatenings and slaughter against the Disciples of the Lord, and he who prayed in the house of Judas in Damascus, were one and the same person. He who had asked for and received letters from the High-Priest to persecute the Church, in a few days after received baptism at the hands of the humble Disciple Ananias, in the name of Jesus. He who stood up before the Sanhedrim, and vindicated the traditions of the fathers, and exposed the imposture of the Nazarene and the shame of the Cross, was the same with him who was transfigured in the third heavens, and saw the exaltation of the Crucified, and the glory of the Cross, in unutterable revelation. He who gave his voice and his vote against the Christians, condemning them to death, was the same with him who said, "I am now ready to be offered." He who, as a young man, guarded the clothes of the men who stoned Stephen, after awhile laid off his own robes, when, as "Paul, the aged," he bared his neck and bowed his head to the sword of the executioner. And still what a change! What a change in the eyes and to the hearts of the Sanhedrim, and the priests! What a change in the eyes and to the hearts of the humble Disciples in Damascus and Jerusalem!

Mingle, if you can, with the little band of Christians in Damascus, when Ananias led Saul, a convert, into their midst! Imagine, if you can, the scene in the Sanhedrim, at Jerusalem, when, expecting intelligence of the extermination of the new faith from Damascus, they listened to the announcement, uttered with the bated breath of fear and dismay, that Saul was a convert and preacher and Apostle of the Nazarene!

VI.—THE EYES OF THE "WORLD."

The Catholic World. New York: Catholic Publication House. October, 1869.
An Imaginary Contradiction.

IN the number of this QUARTERLY for July of the past year, we published an article on the *Spirit of Romanism*, which, we grieve to say, was not satisfactory to our respected contemporary, the *Catholic World*. It complains of us; thinks we have not studied the subject; and declares that we know, in fact, "less than nothing" about it. Precisely how much less is not stated, but we are led to infer that the minus quantity credited to us is very great. Happily, we are not left to bear all this load of ignorance alone, for the *World*, in the generosity of its heart, is kind enough to conclude by saying that "the men"—meaning, doubtless, *all* the men—"who undertake to criticise the Church, and to unchurch her"—naughty people!—"are men who want breadth, depth, and elevation. They are mole-eyed, and have slender claims to be regarded as really enlightened, large-minded, large-hearted men." Poor fellows!

Leaving others to dispose of their "slender claims" as best they may, we must say that, for our part, we have come off better than we could have expected. We looked to have our facts canvassed—the authority of our documents questioned—some of the grave counts in the indictment against Rome which these facts and documents proved, denied; but nothing of the sort is attempted. Discreet *World*—enlightened, large-minded, elevated, and—prudent!

We showed, as our readers may remember, from the history of

Romanism, that, as a system, it was, in its very nature, at war with the spirit of our institutions; that it never had permitted freedom of judgment and of conscience; that it had punished the assertion of this freedom with torture and death; that it had been regarded a solemn duty to extirpate heretics; and that the supreme law of the Church, defining and enforcing this duty, was still binding. In short, that the Church had not changed—but declared and boasted that it never would and never could change. We pointed, also, to its last authoritative dictum—the *Syllabus* of the present Pope—which asserts that Church and State should be united; that the Catholic religion should be "held to be the *only religion* of the State, to the *exclusion* of all other forms of worship;" that "parties emigrating to Catholic countries" should not "be *permitted* the public exercise of their own several forms of worship;" and finally, we showed that this was not simply *European* Catholicism, but that one of the highest dignitaries of the Church in America had said: "We receive it implicitly, we bow to it reverently, we hail it gratefully. To us it is as the voice of God on Sinai, on the Jordan, on Thebor."

These and similar documents we deemed important, in view of the fact that Romanism is seeking to establish itself as *the* religion of America. Will it be believed that our very enlightened contemporary, upon whose attention they were pressed, and to the success of whose cause they are so very damaging, has nothing better to oppose against them than the flimsy rhetoric of "not worth considering!" So very broad and deep and elevated is its intellect, it can not condescend even to "consider" such trifles as involve only the conscience and liberty of thirty-five millions of non-Catholics! They are "not worth" it! But mark you, attentive reader, when we touch upon a matter so immensely important as the consistency of Father Hecker, the *World* is stirred to its very foundations. This is a "point" which deserves "notice"; this furnishes a text for fine writing; a happy occasion for quidlibets and quadlibets—for rhetorical flourishes upon the "Natural" and the "Supernatural," with allusion to a certain *tertium quid*, alias the Roman Catholic Church, which shall bring them happily together with songs and rejoicings.

Well, we surely have no right to complain. True, we should have been glad to be called upon to substantiate our evidences, and to have thus an opportunity for increasing their number and force;

but, as they are now tacitly admitted, and, as it were, established *pro confesso*, we are content to meet the *World* on the ground where it seems to feel some confidence—the consistency of its reverend Father. If the game seem to us hardly worth the candle, we are aware that our contemporary must naturally view the matter with other eyes than ours, and—we are not obstinate.

We argued, as will be remembered, that Father Hecker's fascinating doctrine concerning reason, liberty, independence, and free-will, contradicted the Roman Catholic doctrine of the absolute authority of the Church. In other words, we were not able to see how a man could be *free* from all human authority, and, at the same time, *bound* by human authority! But our inability to see this, says our contemporary, proves only our want of breadth, depth, and elevation. Father Hecker is a "deep" man, and *he* sees it; the *Catholic World* is a "broad" *World*, and *it* sees it; and besides these, there are many others occupying "elevated" places in Church and State, and *they* see it! To all these it is as plain as daylight. Hence, the conclusion is, that there must be something the matter with our eye-sight. We are "mole-eyed," or, peradventure, our trouble is only a *mote*, which a brother's *beamless* orbs may "see clearly" to pull out. This is kindly attempted as follows:

"Father Hecker maintains that no *human* authority has any right to enter the sacred sphere of religion; that man is accountable to no man or body of men for his religion or his faith; but he does not say that he is not responsible to God for the use he makes of his faculties, whether of reason or free-will, or that God has no right to enter the sacred sphere of religion, and tell him, even authoritatively, what is truth, and what he is bound to believe and do. When I believe and obey a human authority in matters of religion, I abdicate my own reason; but when I believe and obey God, I preserve it, follow it, do precisely what reason itself tells me I ought to do. There is no contradiction, then, between believing and obeying God, and the free and full exercise of reason and free-will. Our Cincinnati contemporary seems to have overlooked this very obvious fact, and has, therefore, imagined a contradiction where there is none at all, but perfect logical consistency. Our contemporary is no doubt very able, a great logician, but he is here grappling with a subject which he has not studied, and of which he knows less than nothing."

This is very artistic, it must be confessed. By some theological apparatus, the nature of which we are not permitted to examine, the *human view*, upon which we gazed at first, has been made to *dissolve*, and in its place there comes out one which is wholly and purely *divine*. This is very pretty. It is also very amusing. But is it

honest? Surely the *World* must have known that we made no question respecting man's obligation to *hear God*! Nay, we venture to affirm that the *Christian Quarterly* never contained a sentence that could, by even the most torturing construction, be made to assert that there is any contradiction between believing and obeying *God*, and the free and full exercise of reason and free-will. What Christian does not believe that *the Creator and Redeemer* "has the right to enter the sacred sphere of religion, and tell man even authoritatively what is truth, and what he is bound to believe and do?" This is not the point. Nor has it ever been. Why, then, seek to evade the issue, by gravely arguing a question which is not in debate? We did not attack Father Hecker for teaching that the authority of God was consistent with the freedom of man; but we charged that he asserted man's freedom from the authority or control of *any man*, or *any body of men*, and yet that the Roman Church, which is composed of "men," and which is a "body of men," claimed and exercised the very authority which he said "no body of men" had the right—had "any right"—to exercise. His proposition is unlimited. He does not affirm it generally, but universally. It covers the entire human race—*no man*, *no body of men*. It says nothing of an excepted class, supposed to possess peculiar official gifts and graces; and yet, while uttering and urging this wholesome truth, he himself submits his body, soul, and intellect, without question or reserve, to the unqualified dictation of a "body of men." This, we said, was inconsistent and contradictory. "Not at all," says the *World*; "it is only an apparent contradiction." Nothing is easier, to an elevated man, than to point out the "perfect logical consistency" of all this, and thus to extricate the Reverend Father from the horns of the ugly dilemma with which he was *apparently* about to be gored. In order for the reader to see this, it is only necessary, it seems, for him to admit that man is *bound to hear God*, and then, if he does not clearly discern that he is *not* responsible to "any man" or "any body of men" for his faith, and with equal distinctness that he *is* responsible to a "body of men," the fault, mark you, is not in the logic of the writer, but in the vision of the beholder! If not "mole-eyed," he must see that the Holy Roman Church is, for all intents and purposes of the argument, *very God*.

This position, so amazing—we had almost said so blasphemous—

is not left to be deduced as an inference, though a necessary one from the premises we have quoted. The writer proceeds to argue it upon two grounds: first, the competency of the Church as a witness to the truth; and second, the hypostatic union of the Church with God.

Respecting the first ground, he says:

"All belief, as distinguished from knowledge, is on authority of some sort, and the only question to be asked in any case is, Is the authority sufficient? I believe there were such persons as Alexander the Great, Julius Cæsar, Charlemagne, Louis XIV, Robespierre, and George Washington, on the authority of history; the last two, also, on the testimony of eye-witnesses, or persons who have assured me that they had seen and known them personally; yet, in the case of them all, my belief is belief on authority. . . . Nothing is more unreasonable or more insane than to believe any thing on no authority; that is, with no reason for believing it. To believe without authority for believing, is to believe without reason, and practically a denial of reason itself."

Further on, it is added:

"The Church can declare to be of faith only what God has revealed, and her authority in faith is the authority not of the law-maker, but of the witness and interpreter of the law. . . . That the Church is a competent and credible witness in the case, or an adequate authority for believing that God has revealed what she believes and teaches as his Word, can be as conclusively proved as the competency and credibility of a witness in any case in court whatever. . . . What surrender is there of one's reason, judgment, free-will, manhood, in believing the testimony of a competent and credible witness?"

In charity, we must conclude that the writer of the above was ignorant of the fallacy which pervades it, and is, therefore, to be pitied rather than condemned. He seems not to know, nor even to suspect, that the word authority is ambiguous. Hence, he treats us to a grave *pun*, and fancies it argument. Our readers need not be told the difference between the authority of testimony, which we are *free* to weigh, to consider, to sift, and that of a personal dictator, to which we are *bound* to submit, without question or reservation. The argument of the *World* requires that the *latter* shall be established, but its illustrations are all drawn from the *former*. What harm, it asks, "in believing the testimony of a competent and credible witness?" None whatever, we reply, provided we are permitted to *judge* of that competency and credibility, and to receive the testimony only to the *extent* of its competency and credibility. For example, the Church of the first century is competent to testify as to the facts falling

within its own knowledge. To this extent it may be credited. It testifies as to what was then held to be the Christian faith, doctrine, and practice, and we receive its testimony simply as that of a truthful witness. In the same way we accept the decrees and canons of the Council of Trent as testimony to prove what the Roman Catholic Church believed in the sixteenth century. But whether that belief was right or wrong—whether it was Scriptural or unscriptural—is a totally different question, to be decided upon totally different authority. "I believe there were such persons as Alexander and Cæsar, upon the authority of history," because I have weighed and considered that authority, and it has satisfied my mind; but because I credit history as to matters of fact, am I to submit my faith to the historian as an infallible teacher of doctrine? Such is the argument of the *World*. The Church, it says, is a competent witness—from which it concludes it must be an infallible dictator. Unfortunately, too, it compares its testimony to that of a witness in a court of justice. The comparison is just, but nothing could be more fatal to the argument. For who does not know that the views, opinions, and speculations of a witness, respecting even the very facts about which he testifies, are expressly excluded by every court of justice in the world, as forming no part of the evidence? In like manner we exclude the views, opinions, doctrines, and commandments of the Roman Church as forming no part of her testimony. Infidels and believers, the orthodox and the heretics of the first age, alike testify as to what was received then as the canon of Scripture. To this extent they are competent witnesses, and mutually support each other. But whether their *views* of Scripture were correct is to be determined, not from their own testimony, but from the Scripture itself. Protestants, then, are not so "insane" as to believe upon no authority, nor so absurd as to convert every truthful witness into an infallible teacher. Upon the authority of testimony, both internal and external, they believe the Bible, and upon *its* authority, plain and unambiguous, they reject the doctrines and commandments of the Roman Church.

It remains to consider, finally, the second ground upon which the *Catholic World* rests its case:

"In point of fact, the case is even stronger than we put it. The Church is the body of Christ, and in her dwelleth the Holy Ghost. She is human in her members, no doubt; but she is Divine as well as human in her head. The human

and Divine natures, though forever distinct, are united in one Divine person by the hypostatic union. This one Divine Person, the Word that was made flesh, or assumed flesh, for our redemption and glorification, is the Person of the Church, who, through him, lives a Divine as well as a human life. It is God who speaks in her voice, as it was God who spoke in the voice of the Son of Mary."

Thus we get back to the starting point, the unqualified identification of the Church with God. "This one Divine Person is the Person of the Church." "It is God who speaks in her voice, as it was God who spoke in the voice of the Son of Mary."

Of all the sins of the Romish Church there is none more aggravated than the perversion and deceptive use made of the promise of Christ's presence—of which the above is a fair example. Nothing is more certain than that Christ expressly conditions this blessing upon love and obedience to him. His language is: "If a man love me, he will keep my words: and my Father will love him, and we will come unto him, and make our abode with him." John xiv, 23.

We would respectfully urge our New York contemporary to mark well the bearing of this Scripture. It furnishes a perfect test of the claim put forward for its Church, and one which, if she can abide it, will have more influence in commending her to the acceptance of Protestants than whole volumes of such *petitiones principii* as abound in its pages. Intelligent people, enlightened by this Scripture, will not be satisfied for any man, or any "body of men," simply to assume and assert that Christ is in them—without proof, and, as they believe, against proof—and then to argue from this assumption, as though it were a conceded or an indisputable fact. They require evidence of a claim so exalted; nor will they be content with any thing short of the identical species of evidence which the above Scripture contemplates. That is to say, they will insist that if a man claim that Christ dwells in him, and speaks through him, he shall establish this claim by showing that he keeps and teaches the very "words of Christ." *The claim must be proved by the doctrine, not the doctrine by the claim.* This is Christ's own rule. He has given us his words; we know what they are; and we know that he dwells in those only who keep them. If, then, the Roman Church will furnish evidence on this point; if she will show that *she* keeps Christ's word, to the exclusion of all mere human traditions, Church doctrines, and commandments of men; if she will show her love for Christ by submis-

sion to *his* authority, with infinitely less parade about her own; in short, if she will *speak* only his word, as it was *once for all* delivered to us, we shall then believe that it is indeed the voice of God that speaks in her. But so long as she fails to furnish this evidence, which the case so imperiously requires, her unsupported assertion is no better than that of any other heretical sect, ancient or modern. We "know His voice" and will follow him; but a *stranger* will we not follow, but will flee from him, for we "know not the *voice* of strangers." "Whosoever transgresseth, and abideth not in the *doctrine of Christ*, hath not God. He that abideth in the doctrine of Christ, he hath both the Father and the Son." Still, it is the doctrine that must prove the indwelling, and not an assumed indwelling to authenticate a doctrine—because "many deceivers are gone out into the world." "If there come any unto you, and bring not *this* doctrine, receive him not into your house, neither bid him God-speed." 2 John 7-10.

If we thought it possible to open the eyes of the *World* to see the weakness of its logic, we would beg it to reflect also that the promise of Christ's presence is fulfilled in the person of every genuine individual Christian upon the face of the earth. There is not one in whose heart the Holy Spirit does not dwell; not one who is not made, by "the exceeding great and precious promises," a "partaker of the divine nature." But is this union of the divine with the human such as to make every Christian infallible?—such that, whenever he opens his mouth, God speaks in his voice as he spoke in the voice of the Son of Mary?—with the same wisdom, the same unerring truth, the same divine authority? No one so believes, and yet if the evidence adduced by the *World* has any application in the premises, it bears directly and exclusively upon this very point. The authority of the Church's doctrine, so it teaches, results from the fact of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit. But this same Spirit dwells in the individual Christian. Hence the authority of every individual Christian is precisely equal to that of the Church. In the one case, as in the other, it is *divine*, and therefore supreme and absolute. Hence, the voice of one Christian must have the very same authority as that of one hundred millions, or any other number. Numbers, in truth, can have nothing whatever to do with it. God is not helped by man, nor his authority increased by the support

of man. The divine, however and wherever manifested, equals itself; the divine in one man equals the divine in myriads. Or, better, it is precisely one and the same thing.

If, then, the argument of the *World* proves that the Church is infallible, it proves with the same clearness and conclusiveness that every Christian man and woman upon the earth is equally so. After this, our readers surely will not expect us to follow such a guide any farther. It is evidently bewildered and lost. Would that it might learn that Christ alone has the words of eternal life, and that he dwells, with all his saving and sanctifying virtue, in those only who "keep them!"

LITERARY NOTICES.

- 1.—*Foreign Missions: their Relations and Claims.* By RUFUS ANDERSON, D. D., LL. D., *Late Foreign Secretary of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions.* New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 12mo. pp. 373. 1869.

THIS is a volume of Lectures originally prepared at the request of the Trustees of Andover Theological Seminary, and delivered to three successive Middle Classes of that Institution. They were also delivered at Bangor, Hartford, Auburn, Princeton, and the Union Seminary at New York. They were highly appreciated at all these places by those who heard them, and as they are now published in a cheap and acceptable form, they ought to be widely circulated. They embody the results of the rich experience of one of the most thoughtful, sagacious, and practical men in this country, whose long connection with the oldest and one of our most important Missionary Boards, and whose repeated visits to the fields of missionary labor in Europe and Asia eminently qualify him to speak intelligently upon the subjects of which he treats, and give to his lectures an unusual authoritative importance. The topics discussed give evidence of careful and thorough investigation, and the results are presented in a clear, attractive, and forcible style.

The lectures are not confined to the work of any particular religious denomination. They cover a large field of missionary work, both in this country and Europe, and many of the facts presented are worthy of the most serious consideration by all who feel the importance of sending the Gospel to the nations.

The first lecture is on "An Opening World," and is, perhaps, the most comprehensive and suggestive in the series. He shows how Providence has gradually prepared the heathen nations for the reception of the truth, and exhibits a field that is truly ripe for the harvest. He confines the discussion mainly to Southern, Eastern, and Western Asia, containing a population of more than six hundred millions. He first states the great problems that were to be practically solved:

"I begin with India, because that was the first on which the lever of Providence (so to speak) seemed to move in opening so large a portion of the heathen world. Here, in a population of nearly two hundred millions, it was necessary, first, to break down the

Mohammedan power, extending over most of the country; secondly, to break down the Brahminical power, resting upon caste, and having the sanction of ages; and, thirdly, when the East India Company had answered its purpose, it was needful to bring that great selfish corporation to an end. India was not fully prepared for the entrance of the Gospel until these results were all substantially attained.

"In Western Asia it was necessary, first, that England should secure a predominant influence in the governments of both Turkey and Persia; secondly, that the persecuting ecclesiastical rulers of the Oriental Churches should somehow be so far restrained as to secure a tolerable protection for Protestant converts; thirdly, that the death-penalty in Mohammedan law should be practically nullified; and, fourthly, that Western and Central Asia should be protected against the encroachments of the late ambitious and bigoted Autocrat of Russia.

"In Eastern Asia it was necessary that the great Christian powers of the world should combine to secure a free commercial and religious access to the vast population of China and the neighboring countries.

"We at once see that only the 'Hand which moves the world' could accomplish all this. Fifty years ago no well-informed man would have said that any part of Western, Southern, or Eastern Asia, was fairly open to Christian missions; and no well-informed man can doubt that these countries are now open, with only a few partial exceptions."

Dr. Anderson then proceeds to show how this opening for the Gospel was effected into these extended and populous regions. He traces the steps by which India came into the possession of England; then how religious toleration was partially secured in Turkey and Persia; and, finally, how China was made accessible to the commerce and religion of Christendom. And, after showing that within the last fifty years the most important heathen nations have been thrown open to the Gospel, he devotes the second lecture to the inquiry whether, meantime, corresponding changes have been made in the Christian world; and concludes that the time has now come when there should be a general forward movement in missionary work.

Two important events have taken place since Dr. Anderson's lectures were delivered, which have important bearings upon the matters which he discusses. We refer to the opening of the Pacific railroad and the Suez canal. It is impossible to foretell the influence that these events will have upon the nations of Asia, but it is evident to all that this influence must be very great. Commerce is the forerunner of a Christian civilization, and it can not now be very long before European and American ideas will be felt in all the religious and political movements of the Orient. Surely, if Christians are alive to the importance of the great work of converting the world, they will not be slow to improve the present opportunities for sending the Gospel to the nations.

There are many things in Dr. Anderson's book to which we would be glad to call attention, but our space will not permit. We can not close this notice, however, without copying a portion of his concluding remarks. They ought to excite in every earnest heart a profound interest in the work of spreading the Gospel throughout the whole earth. He says:

"There is no political movement in the world that is commensurate with the missionary movement; none that embraces so many nations, none covering so large a portion of the

globe. It is the Christian Church going forth, under its Great Captain, for the subjugation of the world.

"The imperial warrior, who not many years since convulsed the civilized world with his ambitious schemes, used to make himself intimately acquainted with the nations he designed to conquer. As a means to his end, he studied their geography, numbers, government, and history, with the characteristic ardor of his great mind. Facts were the lights in which he marched through Europe, and none were deemed unimportant that might affect the issue of a campaign or a battle. And in this minuteness and accuracy of information, with a capacity to adapt the means at command to the ends in view, was the secret of his success.

"We, too, are warriors. And though our contest is spiritual, of mind with mind, and heart with heart, and though our weapons are spiritual, and are made effectual only by Divine aid, there is the same demand for inquiry and information, the same scope and necessity for forethought, as in the military enterprise of Napoleon. Indeed, to a very great extent, our inquiries relate to the same classes of objects; only they are surveyed from other points of view, and associated by different relations, and estimated by another species of arithmetic and measurement.

"The Evangelical Church of our day is laboring more and more on system, with a constant advance in her aggressive movements, and is more and more actuated and sustained in her efforts by the powerful principle of faith. The Evangelical Church is not left, however, to faith alone. How much there is to animate and strengthen her faith in beholding the massive walls, at the very entrance of her promised possession, which had so long shut her out from the Pagan world, overthrown at length, like those of Jericho, by the unseen hand of the Almighty! And also in beholding the same Infinite power creating marvelous facilities for traversing the globe, and in witnessing, in the uprising Church, what may prove the beginning of that outpouring of the Spirit—sung by prophets, and longed for by apostles—which is to arouse every Christian land for the universal and decisive conflict!

"The spiritual war for the conquest of the world has certainly begun, and in a manner never seen in any former age. There is not yet, indeed, a popular enthusiasm in the Churches, but that will come. What we most need, just now, is deep, calm, untiring principle; for the contest upon which we have entered is vast, having for its object the reign of Christ over all the earth."

-
- 2.—*The Epistle of Paul to the Romans.* By J. P. LANGE, D. D., and the Rev. F. R. FAY. Translated from the German by J. F. HURST, D. D. With Additions by P. SCHAFF, D. D., and the Rev. W. B. RIDDLE. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 8vo. pp. 455. 1869.

THIS volume of Dr. Lange's great Biblical Commentary will excite very general attention. As it was known that Dr. Lange himself was engaged on the Epistle to the Romans, the public anxiety became very great to see what so profound a thinker and critical scholar would make out of an epistle which had perplexed theologians in every age of the Church. The German edition only partially gratified this anxiety; but we now have the work in a form that will enable the English reader to become acquainted with its contents.

The present edition is the result of the combined labor of Dr. Schaff, general American editor of Lange's *Bible-work*; Dr. Hurst, known to English readers by his "History of Rationalism;" and Rev. Mr. Riddle, an excellent Biblical scholar, and editor of the Commentaries on Galatians and Colossians of the *Bible-work*. Dr. Hurst is responsible for the translation,

which, though a most difficult task, is carefully and satisfactorily done. The Homiletical selections, from the best English sources, are also ascribed to him. The General and Special Introduction, and the first six chapters, which cover about one-half of the volume, were edited by Dr. Schaff; and the remaining portion by Rev. Mr. Riddle. Altogether the work is creditably presented to English readers, and is a valuable contribution to theological literature.

Of the merits of the work itself we can not now speak at length. We can only say, that while Dr. Lange has many high qualifications as a commentator, he has the faults of all German authors of his class. He is too diffuse, and often indistinct. He frequently wearies you with far-fetched interpretations, which can be of no possible benefit to any one, unless it be to illustrate the peculiarities of the German mind. There is, however, much that is fresh and vigorous in Dr. Lange's works; and his Commentary on Romans, though not always free from wrong interpretations, is a very great improvement on the dull, old-fashioned commentaries which were formerly used to produce congestion of the brain, or else a hopeless despair of understanding the Bible.

That which distinguishes Dr. Lange, as indeed it does all German commentators, is the freedom of his mind from theological bias. He is evidently not frightened at the "*odium theologicum*," and, hence, states his convictions without the fear of ecclesiastical courts. In this respect he is far in advance of his American editor. Dr. Schaff is generally candid; but when he comes to such passages as Romans vi, 4, he can not allow Dr. Lange's unqualified statement, that reference is there made to immersion, to pass, without a foot-note for the benefit of Pedo-Baptists in this country. This foot-note is itself a very considerable curiosity. After admitting that "all commentators of note (except Stuart and Hodge) expressly admit, or take it for granted, that in this verse, especially in *συνετάφημεν* and *ἠγέρθη*, the ancient prevailing mode of baptism by immersion and emersion is implied, as giving additional force to the idea of the going down of the old and the rising up of the new man," he says that "immersionists make an unwarranted use of this passage," because "immersion is not commanded here, but simply alluded to; and that the *immersion*, or *κατάβουσις*, is one part of the baptismal act, symbolizing the going down of the old man of sin, and that the *emersion*, or *ἀνάβουσις*, of the new man of righteousness, is just as essential to complete the idea." Hence he concludes that "immersion is undoubtedly a more expressive form than sprinkling; yet the efficacy of the sacrament does not depend upon the quantity or quality of water, nor upon the mode of its application." Who will for a moment believe that Dr. Schaff would have been guilty of such a piece of special pleading as this, if he had been writing for the same class of readers for whom Dr. Lange wrote? Evidently the

difference of the views of these eminent critics is caused by the difference in their geographical positions. One was writing in Germany, and for Germans; the other was writing in America, for Americans. The Germans, as a class, are very little under the influence of theological dogmas; the American people are very generally slaves to religious partyism. Hence it will be readily seen that a book for American consumption must tread lightly upon controverted theological opinions. The German edition is largely free from this very grave defect. It is written with only one purpose in view, namely, to ascertain, if possible, the mind of the Divine Original, without regard to the safety of popular dogmas. And this single fact makes us wish that we could have had the German edition, *sine mutatu*, translated into the English. It can not be denied, however, that many of the additions of the American editors are very valuable, as they throw light on much that was obscure in the German work.

Altogether this volume is the most complete and thorough commentary on Romans that has appeared from the American press. It is especially valuable for its* exhaustive introductions. These of themselves are worth the price of the book.

-
- 3.—*Yesterday, To-Day, and Forever. A Poem in Twelve Books.* By EDWARD HENRY BICKERSTETH, M. A., *Incumbent of Christ's Church, Hampstead, and Chaplain to the Bishop of Ripon.* New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 12mo. pp. 441. 1870.

We confess to have experienced a very high degree of satisfaction in reading this poem; and our interest in it was doubtless increased by the surprise which its unexpected value produced. We had come to consider modern epics as a sort of form of poetry without the power, and of course were slow to believe that Mr. Bickersteth's poem would form an exception to the general rule. We are glad to say, however, that in this we were mistaken. "Yesterday, To-day, and Forever" is an epic of the first class. In fact, we doubt whether a nobler poem has appeared in the English language since the publication of Milton's "Paradise Lost."

The first book opens naturally, describing the narrator's death and descent to Hades. We do not remember to have read any thing more touching and beautiful than the death scene. The seer's farewells to his wife and children are given with a pathos and tenderness unequaled in any thing we have ever seen. Then the actual separation of soul and body is described with masterly effect. The same strain of beautiful and impressive description characterizes the second book, "The Paradise of the Blessed Dead." Nothing could be more felicitous than the representation of the seer's meeting with his lost babes, and with the members of his own flock who had passed into the spirit-land. "The Prison of the Lost,"

though not so graphic as Dante's "Inferno," shows, nevertheless, wonderful power at word-painting. "The Creation of Angels and of Men;" "The Fall of Angels and of Men;" "The Empire of Darkness;" and "Redemption," are all interesting chapters. The character of Lucifer in these is very graphically drawn. The process by which his mind is led away from his allegiance to a fancied independence is described with masterly skill. We think, however, the last four chapters, the "Bridal of the Lamb," "The Millennial Sabbath," "The Last Judgment," and "The Many Mansions," are superior to any in the book. The theology is highly materialistic, but the poetry is of unusual grandeur. Mr. Bickersteth is evidently most at home in describing celestial scenery, and his pictures of the "Last Judgment," and "The Many Mansions," have never been excelled, if, indeed, they have ever been equaled. He has not, however, either the bold imagination or classic finish of Milton; but he is truer to Nature, and more sympathetic, than the author of "Paradise Lost." He resembles Shelley, especially in his delicate perception of the beautiful. He has a chaste imagination, a graceful diction, and has written a poem that deserves to be classed among the noblest productions of the human mind.

4.—*Evidences of Natural and Revealed Theology.* By CHARLES E. LORD. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 8vo. pp. 580. 1869.

THE questions that are discussed in this volume are just now exciting unusual interest. Hence any work that will assist the general reader or student to become familiar with the modern phases of the controversy between Reason and Revelation will doubtless meet with public favor.

The work of Mr. Lord can not lay claim to much that is original, but is an excellent compendium of the arguments in favor of the Bible and the Christian religion from an orthodox point of view. To the theological student it will certainly be very acceptable, as it contains copious gleanings from works that are not generally accessible. This is particularly true of the first part of the work, which is devoted to the discussion of Natural Theology.

The author treats with considerable freshness and vigor the Rationalism of the present day, though not always in the spirit of that charity which "thinketh no evil." He has evidently no very exalted respect for the modern opponents of Christianity. One of the most remarkable facts in this connection is, that while he devotes considerable space to the examination of the development theory, he omits all reference to Darwin, who may be said to have given that theory its modern impulse.

It must be evident to all thinking men that the question of the Divine character of the Christian religion is not yet settled in all minds; and, until

it is settled, we must expect to have use for such works as Mr. Lord has written, as antidotes to the Infidel productions that are flooding the land. We are inclined to think, however, that Christian writers would accomplish more if they would pitch their works on a different key. A defense of orthodoxy is not exactly equivalent to a defense of Christianity. This fact has not been very generally accepted, but is beginning to be understood. This is a hopeful sign.

5.—*History of England, from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth.*
By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M. A., *Late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford.* Volumes I and II. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 12mo.
pp. 447, 501. 1870.

WE welcome this new edition of the most popular History of England that has ever been written. Its circulation in Europe is already almost equal to that of Macaulay's, while in this country it is rapidly becoming a general favorite. And, it can not be denied that this popularity is well deserved. For, while Mr. Froude has selected a field which has often been explored, he has shown that the materials in it had by no means been exhausted by previous historians. In his researches, the Spanish archives in the Castle Simancas, and the records of the Inquisition, were thrown open to him by the Madrid Government. He had also free access to the private papers of Lord Cecil, at Hatfield, England, and to the imperial archives at Paris. From these varied sources he has derived a vast amount of material, which gives a very different phase to many historical facts and persons from what has been the commonly-received opinion. For instance, he boldly attempts to defend the character of Henry VIII, and does not hesitate to declare that Anne Boleyn was not the saint she is generally supposed to have been. Mr. Froude will doubtless modify the popular judgment to some extent on these subjects, but it is tolerably certain that his argument will not be generally accepted as conclusive.

Mr. Froude has excellent qualifications as a historian; for, to unwearied patience in research, and wonderful powers of generalization, he unites an eloquent, lucid, and graphic style. He belongs to the school of Carlyle, but is free from the eccentricities of that great writer. He has few, if any, equals in industry and a profound study of his subject, while his discussions of questions are always calm and natural in tone. His style is unaffected, while his portraits of men and things are always life-like. His powers of description are unequalled by any other historian.

The present edition of Mr. Froude's History is in very desirable form. It unites convenience of size with clearness of type, substantial binding, and remarkable cheapness. All these are qualities that will commend it to the people, and will greatly facilitate its general introduction into this country.

- 6.—*History of the Reformation in Europe in the Time of Calvin.* By J. H. MERLE D'AUBIGNE, D. D., *Author of the "History of the Reformation of the Sixteenth Century,"* etc. Vol. V. England, Geneva, Ferrara. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 12mo. pp. 470. 1869.

D'AUBIGNE'S "History of the Reformation" is as familiar to American as to European readers. In fact, it is about the only history of that great period that has been generally circulated in this country. The present volume is the fifth of the second series, and is chiefly devoted to the Reformation in England and Geneva. It takes a very different view of Henry VIII and Anne Boleyn from that taken by Mr. Froude. D'Aubigné makes Henry VIII one of the cruelest and most Godless of monarchs, while he defends the innocence of Anne with an enthusiasm which is equaled only by his evident sincerity.

We have been especially interested in that portion of the volume which treats of the Reformation in Geneva. We have here vividly portrayed the progress, struggles, and martyrs of the great movement which completely revolutionized Geneva religiously, and furnished the materials for the religious system of the great Calvinistic branch of Protestantism. The volume closes with Calvin's arrival at Geneva, and what took place during the summer of 1536.

As a historian, D'Aubigné excels in the clearness of his statements; but he does not always treat facts with that impartiality which the interest of truth requires. He has shown a commendable industry in the preparation of his great work, and, should he live to finish it according to his plan, it will be a worthy monument to the genius and learning of one of the noblest men of modern times.

-
- 7.—*Wonders of the Deep. A Companion to Stray Leaves from the Book of Nature.* By M. SCHELE DE VERE. New York: G. P. Putnam & Son. 12mo. pp. 351. 1869.

ONE of the healthful signs of the times is the popularity of works on Natural History. The best writers of the times have willingly lent their aid toward popularizing subjects which heretofore have been familiar to only a few. The French have recently taken the lead in this very important work, and such writers as Figuier, Michelet, Menault, Mangin, etc., have made valuable contributions on various subjects connected with Natural History. These works have been translated into English, and now find a ready sale in this country.

We had supposed that Figuier and Mangin had about exhausted the ocean world; but, since looking into Prof. Schele De Vere's "*Wonders of the Deep*," we are satisfied we were mistaken. Prof. De Vere's book covers much less ground than that occupied by Louis Figuier's "*Ocean World*" and

Arthur Mangin's "*Mysteries of the Ocean*," but it is exhaustive of what it does cover, and presents, in a graphic and racy style, a series of monographs on sundry oceanic subjects, as, "Odd Fish," "Pearls," "Corals," "The Knight in Armor," "Mine Oyster," etc.

It is difficult to characterize such a work as the "Wonders of the Deep." It can not be said to be strictly scientific, and yet it conveys a vast amount of scientific knowledge. It seems to have been the object of the author to see how much that is truly enjoyable might be written concerning objects of which we generally care to know very little. In this he has certainly succeeded, and has given us a book that will be heartily welcomed by all classes of readers.

8.—*The Writings of Madame Swetchine. Edited by* COUNT DE FALLOUX, *of the French Academy. Translated by* H. W. PRESTON. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 16mo. pp. 255. 1869.

THOSE who have read the "Life and Letters of Madame Swetchine" need not be told that this little book contains many beautiful gems. Rarely have we seen a better example of the *multum in parvo*. These writings were never intended for publication, and were written at different times; some of them "without any fixed plan or reliable dates, upon loose leaves, thrust successively into an envelope, or rolled into a shapeless bundle, and confined by a pin." The labor of collecting these, and arranging them into any thing like an intelligible form, was evidently very considerable, and the editor deserves the thanks of the reading public for the faithful manner in which he has performed his difficult task.

That our readers may have a taste of the quality of the book, we give a few specimens from "Airelles" and "Thoughts":

"Let our lives be pure as snow-fields, where our footsteps leave a mark, but not a stain."

"There are souls, which, like the pontiffs of the ancient law, live only on the sacrifices they offer."

"What is resignation? It is putting God between one's self and one's grief."

"There can be no little things in this world, seeing that God mingles in all."

"Faith amid the disorders of a sinful life is like the lamp burning in an ancient tomb."

"It is but just that we should purchase our pleasures, but the moment when we pay is a hard one."

"There are hearts whose mere kindness sheds more rays than the love of others, as the moon of Naples shines a softer splendor than many a sun."

"To love our friends is often not enough to satisfy them. We must also hate those whom they do not love."

Madame Swetchine was a Roman Catholic, and some of her writings are tainted by the doctrines of the "Mother Church." But, as a general thing, they are free from sectarian bias, and are worthy to be read by all who love the true, the beautiful, and the good.

- 9.—*A Collection of the Proverbs of all Nations. Compared, Explained, and Illustrated.* By WALTER K. KELLY. Andover: Warren F. Draper. 16mo. pp. 232. 1869.

THIS is not only an interesting, but a very valuable book. The proverbs of a nation very generally indicate the character of its civilization; for, as Lord Bacon has truly said, "the genius, wit, and spirit of a nation are discovered in its proverbs." Hence, in studying these proverbs we are studying history—history, too, in its most concentrated form, and of the most valuable kind.

We are especially thankful to the author of this little volume, as it contains the only comprehensive collection of proverbs in the English language adapted to general use. The arrangement is very convenient, the proverbs being grouped together according to their import and affinity, under appropriate headings, with their originals generally appended in foot-notes. In this way we have the same proverb, slightly varied, in several different languages, which fact clearly demonstrates that many of these sententious sayings have their foundation in universal human experience.

-
- 10.—*Mizpah. Friends at Prayer.* By LAFAYETTE C. LOOMIS. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 12mo. pp. 391. 1869.

THIS book is alike beautiful in its conception, execution, and the dress in which it is presented by the publishers. It proposes morning and evening Scripture readings, and an evening meditation. The morning readings embrace the Psalms twice; and the evening the New Testament entire, during the year. The meditations are intended to follow the Scripture, and precede the prayer, and are generally upon the evening reading. They are simply devotional reflections, many of which have special reference to associate reading with friends, which exercise, it is claimed, will make us more faithful to our closet. The book is well calculated to develop our social and devotional natures, and belongs to a class of works, the extent of whose circulation is not a very unfair measure of the amount of piety among Christian people.

-
- 11.—*The Day Dawn and the Rain, and other Sermons.* By REV. JOHN KER, Glasgow, Scotland. New York: Robert Carter & Brothers. 12mo. pp. 450. 1869.

MOST of these sermons are of a practical character, and are generally marked by an elevated sentiment, genial sympathies, and a profound reverence for Scripture truth. A few of them discuss some of the higher questions which lie in the path of Christian and philosophical research. These display pre-eminent ability, and abound with many brilliant and original

thoughts. The central idea of all the sermons seems to be Christ and him crucified; and this single fact is their highest recommendation. The style is vigorous, and glows with a healthy imagination, which inspires the thoughts with a sort of poetic fervor, and makes the volume unusually pleasant reading for a book of sermons.

-
- 12.—*Sybaris and other Homes.* By EDWARD E. HALE. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. 16mo. pp. 206. 1869.

THIS volume introduces a most important subject for the consideration of Americans. How to elevate the condition of the poor in our great cities is a problem which is surely worthy of much earnest reflection. If Mr. Hale has not solved it, he has certainly contributed something in that direction, in his very readable papers. We hope that his book will be generally read; for it is none the less valuable because of the humor which sparkles and plays on every page. He can not write on any subject in a dull, prosy style; but there is, nevertheless, a deep pathos of feeling underlying all that he says, and his book contains many practical suggestions of very great value.

-
- 13.—*A Physician's Problems.* By CHARLES ELAM, M. D., M. R. C. P. Boston: Fields, Osgood & Co. 12mo. pp. 400. 1869.

THIS is a really thoughtful work, mainly discussing those questions of "Thought and Action, whose domain is the debatable ground of Brain, Nerve, and Mind." It enters largely into the questions of vice and virtue, and says some excellent things; but we think many of its positions are untenable.

We hope to give this volume a more extended notice in some future number of the *Quarterly*, but, for the present, can only say that it will repay a careful reading by all who are interested in the physical and moral elevation of the race.

-
- 14.—*The Woman who Dared.* By EPES SARGENT. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 16mo. pp. 270. 1870.

THIS is a poem in blank verse, of some five thousand lines, not one of which is likely to be mistaken for poetry. It presents a phase of the woman question, and is specially intended to teach the doctrine that women can "pop the question" as well as "any other man." We have only this to say of the work: as a literary production it is a failure; and as a power in the "woman movement," will not be of much value. We are inclined to think that, no matter how much the woman "dared," Mr. Sargent has "dared" still more, to give such a book to the public, and call it poetry.

- 15.—*Man in Genesis and in Geology; or, The Biblical Account of Man's Creation, Tested by Scientific Theories of his Origin and Antiquity.* By JOSEPH P. THOMPSON, D. D., LL. D. New York: Samuel R. Wells. 12mo. pp. 149. 1870.

THIS is a popular treatise on an important subject, and throws much light on the present controversy in reference to the Bible and Science. The author seems to have studied his subject with considerable care, and has condensed a great many facts that will be of service to the general reader, and has presented them in a forcible and attractive style. We hope the work will generally circulate.

-
- 16.—*Rhetoric: A Text-Book, Designed for use in Schools and Colleges, and for Private Study.* By REV. E. O. HAVEN, D. D., LL. D., President of the North-Western University at Evanston, Illinois; Late President of the University of Michigan. New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo. pp. 381. 1869.

THE author claims for this work that it has grown out of the experience of the class-room, and is not, therefore, an arbitrary arrangement of the subjects discussed. We regard it as one of the best books of the kind we have seen, and doubt not that it will very generally command the attention of educators.

-
- 17.—*The Sunset Land; or, The Great Pacific Slope.* By REV. JOHN TODD, D. D. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 16mo. pp. 322. 1870.

No more sprightly and vigorous work has yet appeared on the Sunset Land than this unpretending volume. Since the opening of the Pacific Railroad California is brought very near to us, and Dr. Todd has given us a very pleasing and interesting picture of some of its most important features.

FOREIGN LITERATURE.

- 18.—*Pestalozzi's Sammtliche Werke. Gesichtet, vervollständigt und mit erläuternden Einleitungen versehen von L. W. SEYFFARTH. 1 Heft.* (Pestalozzi's Complete Works. Sifted, rendered complete, and furnished with explanatory introductions, by L. W. SEYFFARTH. Part I.) Brandenburg, on the Havel. 1869.

It is with unfeigned pleasure that we fulfill the duty of chronicling a new and complete edition of the works of the coryphæus of modern education. The first publication of a complete edition of Pestalozzi's works was begun in 1818, by his friend and co-laborer, Schmid, and completed in

1826. Fifteen volumes were published, but many things not written by Pestalozzi himself found their way into this edition, while quite a number of his own writings were left out. No works could have been edited with less care, and certainly none ever needed more thorough and painstaking revision than these. For, though a great educator, and, in a certain sense, a great writer, he was an incorrigible sloven, not only in his person, but in his works. His orthography was abominable, his style redundant, and his argument often totally wanting in method. The revision, however, of such writings as Pestalozzi's is a very delicate task, attended with the greatest difficulty. In the attempt to put them into a presentable dress there is great danger of toning them down to such an extent that their individuality is all but effaced, and the author himself obliterated. A striking example of this occurred in Pestalozzi's first experience as an author. Standing amid the wreck of his fortune, after the utter failure of his institution in Neuhaus, scarcely knowing where to find bread from one day to another, it was suggested to him to turn his attention to literature. He had already written one or two small pieces, which had given great satisfaction to his friends; but, when the prospect was held out to him of obtaining a livelihood by such means, and of accomplishing something at the same time for the amelioration of human woe, it seemed, he says, as if some one were relating a dream to him. He went to work, nevertheless, and the result was the story of "Lienhard and Gertrud," a work which made his name famous in all Europe. But, on showing the manuscript to a friend, he was told that, although interesting, it would be impossible to print it in its then shape, it being insufferably incorrect and "unliterary;" it needed revision by some one who had literary practice. Unassuming as a child, Pestalozzi at once assented to this, and put a part of the work into the hands of a person whom his friend indicated. What was his astonishment when he received it again! "It was," he says in his "Swan-song," "a piece of real theological student work, which had transformed the purely natural picture of genuine peasant-life as I had exhibited it, simple and artless, in its naked but faithful reality, into canting artistic forms, making the peasants in the tavern speak a straight-laced schoolmaster language, so that of the peculiarity of my book not a single trace was left." The editor of the present edition, who promises to do whatever lies in his power toward rendering the style of the author intelligible, and getting rid of his ever-recurring repetitions, will, it is to be hoped, in the light of the above experience, use his pruning knife with discretion, and with that "piety" which is due to such a writer.

The works of Pestalozzi have long been out of print, and difficult to obtain, and we trust that their republication will tend greatly to enlarge the circle of his readers. Not that we think the value of these works will be

found where persons unacquainted with them would expect to find it. Pestalozzi is commonly regarded as the father of what is now universally known as *object-teaching*, of that method of instruction which begins with the cultivation of the perceptive faculties, which teaches, as it is often expressed, things before words. Nothing can be farther from the truth than this, if it is meant that he elaborated, or even had an idea of, any such system of instruction as that followed by the most enlightened object-teachers of the present day. It is true that Pestalozzi enunciated the great principle that the child must form its own conceptions from direct contemplation of the things themselves, and not be stuffed with words that have no connection with any thing in its experience, and which are, therefore, in the strictest sense, *empty*. It is certainly a great thing to have had such a thought as this, a thought which lies at the basis of all sound instruction. But it is a great seminal principle, of whose scope and import Pestalozzi can scarcely be said to have dreamed. He was a reformer who did not know the meaning of his own watchword, and who never even attempted to put the principle under consideration into practice. His uniform practice was *word-teaching*, and nothing else. What should we say to a teacher, nowadays, whose object-lessons should consist in writing nouns on the blackboard, accompanied by adjectives expressing qualities supposed to pertain to the things expressed by the nouns; for example, the noun "eel," accompanied by such adjectives as "slippery," "leathern-skinned," "vermiform"? And yet this was Pestalozzi's method of procedure. He even taught geography without the use of maps or globes: it was the mere learning, with slight mechanical aids, of interminable lists of names. Indeed, Pestalozzi was utterly unfitted by the course of his own training to give such instruction as is now comprehended under the term object-teaching. He was neither a good learner nor a sharp observer, and had no regard for what was going on in the world of science around him. In the midst of his pedagogical activity he prided himself in not having read a book for thirty years. He was a giant struggling with a great thought, which he found it impossible to carry out.

What was the great thought with which he struggled? It was, that by better instruction the condition of the poor might be improved. He was convinced that nothing effectual could be expected in this direction from the governments of his time, and he therefore resolved to strike deeper. He saw that education, like every other good thing, must begin at home. And his great desire was to so systematize the elements of culture as to make it possible for the poorest and most ignorant mother to impart them at the fireside, and thus render the family, in this regard, independent of the State. It was his ambition to so simplify instruction that the pupil would require only mechanical aid from the teacher. "*Vous voulez mécaniser*

l'éducation," said a distinguished person, to whom he was explaining his system; and he himself confesses that this person hit the nail on the head. The great need of the poorer classes was, as it seemed to him, knowledge and mechanical skill. In the institution which he founded at Neuhof, he sought to impart both, and failed in both, from utter incapacity for business of any sort. He had no power to organize his thought in any direction whatever.

But, with all his short-comings, Pestalozzi had a great soul, which yearned to accomplish something for the welfare of mankind. There breathes through all his life a spirit of the widest and noblest philanthropy. This spirit entered into all his teachings, and it fills all his books. It was this genuine philanthropic spirit which molded anew, in a far more profound sense than is indicated in the foregoing, the whole theory of education. The essence of the Pestalozzian reform consists in going back to the original etymological meaning of the term education. It is drawing out, instead of pouring in. It is a system based on human nature itself, which seeks to discover and to develop the natural aptitudes of the mind, beginning always at the center, and working out toward the periphery, beginning with what is nearest and most urgent, and proceeding gradually to that which is farther off and less imperative. The cardinal principle of the Pestalozzian method teaches that the first business of education is to develop a pure humanity. It insists that the man is more than the *metier*; that it is of prime importance to have good men and women, while only of secondary to have good linguists or lawyers, good mechanics, farmers, or preachers. It is the moral and religious basis of education that Pestalozzi every-where insists on. It is this that makes his work of abiding value. And these are the considerations which ought to commend him to the earnest study of American educators. Not that he himself ever realized these visions and inspirations: few reformers do. He left them a legacy for the future, and we, the children of that future, have reduced some of them to practice. Time, we trust, will take care also of the rest.

-
- 19.—*Das Christenthum und die moderne Naturwissenschaft.* Von I. FROHSCHAMMER. Wien: Tendler & Co. 1868. (Christianity and Modern Natural Science, by I. FROHSCHAMMER. Vienna: Tendler & Co. 1868.)

WHAT the well-known author, who is a Roman Catholic priest, and Professor of Philosophy in the University of Munich, had published before, in essays, pamphlets, and reviews, on the relation of revealed religion to natural science, we have, in the work before us, not only collected or condensed, but developed into an organic whole. That the reconciliation of revelation and natural science, in such a manner that neither appears as the servant of the other, but that justice is done to both, is the aim of the

endeavors of very many good and intelligent minds of the 19th century, is well known, and the conclusions at which such a man as Frohschammer arrives, whose thoroughness of research and comprehensiveness of information are well known, and who, moreover, is so enthusiastically devoted to truth, or what he deems truth, that he is willing to make any sacrifice for it, have a sterling interest for the whole educated world; and we shall, therefore, lay the quintessence of his book before our readers, without expressing our agreement with, or dissent from, every one of his positions. His book is divided into nine chapters. The burden of the whole, as given repeatedly by the author himself, is:

"As the Roman Catholic Church at first rejected, yea forbade, as heretical and antiscip-
tural, the Copernican system, but was compelled, in the course of time, to recognize its truth,
so the traditional Church-view of the world must succumb, in many more points, to the light
of the exact natural sciences, and thus undergo one change after another, in consequence of
the final recognition of the at first combated progress of this science."

This proposition is exhaustively discussed in chapter i—"Christianity and the Copernican system." The conclusion at which the author arrives is:

"Over against the sacred Scripture, and the authority of the Church, the vast import of
the Copernican system is, that it has set science free, by the struggle which it entered into
with the Church, and triumphantly sustained. It has become apparent, that over against
science even the apparently plainest teachings of the Scriptures, and the most explicit con-
demnation by the authorities of the Church, are of no avail, but have to yield to the results
of science, which they can also do without imperiling the true nature of Christianity. The
letter of the Scriptures was plainly against the teaching of Copernicus; the Church empha-
sized this contradiction, branding the new doctrine as subversive of the Christian Catholic
truth, but, nevertheless, now recognizes the truth of the system, confessing thereby that she
erred in this point, that her exposition of the Scriptures on such points is unreliable, that
science is, therefore, perfectly justifiable in going forward on its independent path, etc. For
science must be free and independent, must obey only its own laws, without being influenced
or controlled by any foreign power or usurpation in its principle, method, or results. The
eventful struggle against the Copernican system has proved, clearly, how very wrong the
Church does in presuming to decide in matters of science, and how great a danger she
incurs thereby of jeopardizing her own existence, and damaging the cause of truth and
religion."

The value of the chapter is enhanced by the decree of condemnation against Copernicus, and the formula of abjuration being added *verbatim et literatim*.

Chapter ii treats of the "Origin of the Organic in Nature." The materialistic doctrine of a *generatio æquivoca* is here thoroughly refuted, and its history given. The other theory of the eternity of organic entities in the universe, and their cyclical appearance and disappearance in various parts of the universe, is equally ably handled and refuted. In a masterly manner it is shown that the appearance of organic life in creation proves the existence of a supermundane, and, at the same time, world-indwelling Creator.

Chapter iii treats of the "Development of the Organic, or the Origin of Species in the Vegetable and the Animal Kingdom." Frohschammer advocates the theory of development or gradual perfection, idealized by the assumption of a theological factor, saying:

"All organic nature appears as a great organism, commencing with the small and insignificant, as germ, embryo, etc., but gradually developing, according to a fixed and immanent law, into many and various members, so that the manifold classes and kinds of organic life must be contained, virtually, potentially, and designedly, in the primitive organism from which they have branched off and differentiated themselves."

On the relation of the oft-repeated word of the Scriptures, "after his kind—after their kind," to his theory, he says:

"The scientifically-recognized and established fact of a very imperfect beginning, and of a gradual development of the world in general, and of organic nature in particular, must be reconciled with the theistic conviction of the reality of a divine creation; the gross contradiction between both must be removed by assuming a world that was very imperfect in its beginning, which carried, however, in itself a great, free, and independent perfection, that is, perfection potentially."

He reprints an essay that he had published six years before, in his *Athenæum*, "On Charles Darwin's Theory as to the Origin of the Various Species in the Animal and Vegetable Kingdoms," and avows that his views on this point have undergone no change whatever.

Chapter iv treats of "the Origin and Essence of Mankind" (difference between man and beast); and chapter v, of "the Unity and Age of Man." Language, religious belief, science, and art, constitute, according to him, fundamental differences between man and beast, and are the highest prerogatives of man. The question, whether "the chronology of the Bible is to be dropped, and a higher antiquity to be claimed for man, in order to gain time for the origin of the races," or whether "this chronology is to be retained, and the very possibility of the origin of the races from a common stock to be given up," he answers in favor of the first theory, saying:

"The Bible, or its theological interpretation, can no more be decisive in this than in any other naturalistic and anthropological question, and the results of science can not be tested by passages of the Bible or theological opinions as final criteria."

He admits, however, that the methods generally adopted in determining the age of the earth, and of mankind, are any thing but safe and reliable.

Chapter vi discusses physical and moral evil in the world. Our author assumes, that death reigned in the vegetable and animal world before the creation of man, hence independently of the fall of Adam, or of the earlier fall of the angels; that God willed this death as a necessary form of development, and that, for this reason, it can not be taken for an evil. This view he transfers, virtually, also to man, saying:

"As a pure, free, and perfect original state of man offers insurmountable difficulties to independent scientific research, so physical evils, and death itself, must appear to independent

and consistent thought, as unavoidable, and qualifiedly, necessary for human existence as well as for all animal life; in the case of man, for his intellectual and moral development and perfection."

On the religious aspect of physical evil he says:

"By an unreserved surrender to God's will, in faith and love, physical and moral evil disappear as non-existing. By ethical efforts, by moral acts of love to God and our fellow-men, moral evil is avoided and conquered, and physical evil loses its sting. This may be called the Christian solution of the question; to this comes, through human science, another one, which may be called the ideal or real-ideal one, which is realized through a thorough knowledge of nature and of man, in consequence whereof the forces of nature are conquered, and evils are avoided, and man advances gradually toward the realization of the ideal of humanity."

In chapter vii the author discusses the problems of miracles, and the divine government of the world. Praying for earthly blessings he considers as opposed to the spirit of Christianity, and inveighs strongly against the superstitious love of miracles as displayed by the Catholic Church. He says:

"Religion will more and more lay aside every thing external, and become internal, as the very nature of religion requires; miracles will no longer be sought after by faith and the religious cult as necessary for man's religious life; but the real miracles will be wrought by active love of our fellow-men, and an upright, moral conduct."

Chapter viii treats of the "Historical Spiritual development and Civilization of Man, and his rising superior to Nature;" and chapter ix, of "Christianity and Modern Civilization." As an ideally perfected and thoroughly spiritualized religion, Christianity will have no longer any need of present or past miracles, carrying the proof of its divinity in itself. From this short summary it appears, indeed, that what Frohschammer so ardently desires, a real reconciliation between Revelation and Science, he has not accomplished; but he has, nevertheless, taken a step in the right direction, and the appearance of his book in an English dress might be timely and beneficial.

20.—*Die Darwin'sche Theorie und ihre Stellung zu Moral und Religion, von* DR. G. JÆGER. (The Darwinian Theory and its Relation to Morals and Religion. By DR. G. JÆGER.) Stuttgart. Crown 8vo. pp. 150. 1869.

At the last International Congress of Naturalists one of the leading scientific men of the age, Professor Helmholtz, of Heidelberg, proposed to ascertain, by a standing vote, to what extent the Darwinian System was received among experts, and how far there was still opposition to it. The result was a unanimous vote in its favor. Of course, not all the Naturalists in the world were present; but it is a significant fact that among those who were present there was no dissenting voice. Now, as this theory is often, and we suppose generally, regarded as subversive of all religion, it is of the

utmost importance to know whether all scientific men who accept it are prepared to relinquish religion as a thing of the past. The great majority of them, confounding, as they do, religion with the special doctrinal systems of the Church, are doubtless sworn enemies to every form of religious faith. There is, however, a minority, though small, which has sense enough to see that the religious sentiment is inherent in human nature, and is, therefore, far from regarding religious belief and religious life as a mere superstition. They have, furthermore, the sense to see that no scientific theory, so long as it remains purely scientific, is or can be Atheistic. The moment science claims to have discovered the ultimate causes of things, or asserts that there is no ultimate cause, it has transcended its limits, and its *dicta* are entitled to no more consideration than the ravings of a bedlamite. That pseudo-science, whose chief occupation is preaching a Godless universe, will some day burst of its own flatulence, and disappear, like many another bubble of human speculation.

Among those who feel the necessity of religion, in spite of all theories, is the author of the work whose title stands at the head of this notice. The book is based on a course of lectures delivered by the author last winter in Stuttgart, for the purpose of defending Darwinism against the charge of immoral and irreligious tendencies. We translate a few paragraphs from the recapitulation at the close of the last lecture, that our readers may judge for themselves of the position which Dr. Jæger occupies. He characterizes the position of the Darwinian, as he understands it, in a few brief and pregnant propositions :

"The Darwinian places himself, from conviction, on the basis of Christianity, at the side of the practical pastor, whose duty and task it is to educate men not to be scholars, but to be men; and he defends the foundations of Christianity, I say expressly the *foundations*, not the excesses and abuses, which are, alas! often enough connected with it.

"He does battle against intolerance in two directions: he defends the naturalist's objective method of investigation against those theologians who wish to compel him to assume only the subjective stand-point, and he defends the anthropocentric stand-point of religion against the intolerant coteries among naturalists and philosophers, who wish to compel man to give up all self-defense by requiring him to assume the objective stand-point.

"He furthermore does battle against fatalism, let it have its root wherever it may, in the consequences of materialism, in the consequences of the critical philosophy, or in the abuse of certain doctrines of religion."

At the close of the lectures Dr. Jæger furthermore offered to defend at any time, in public debate, among other things, "the principles of the Christian religion against materialists and against hostile philosophical schools."

One thing this book demonstrates, namely, that a man may be very heterodox in science without being *intentionally* an enemy of the Christian religion. Whether the Darwinian theory can be reconciled with the Bible is another question. We do not think it can.

- 21.—*Die Fortdauer nach dem Tode. Von MELCHIOR MEYR.* (Continued Existence after Death. By MELCHIOR MEYR.) Leipzig. 12mo. pp. 129. 1869. *Tod und Auferstehung, die Gestalt des unvergänglichen Lebens. Drei Ostervorträge* (1869), in der freireligiösen Gemeinde zu Berlin. Von A. T. WISLICENUS. (Death and Resurrection, the form of the Imperishable Life. Three Easter Lectures (1869), in the Free Religious Congregation at Berlin. By A. T. WISLICENUS.) Berlin.

THESE books are not of such a character that we take great pleasure in announcing them. They are both of very light caliber, and the authors might well have spared themselves the trouble of writing them, and even the limited public they will find, the trouble of reading them, for any good that will be likely to come of it. Certainly any one who needs the kind of proof of immortality which Herr Meyr undertakes to furnish, must be in a very bad way; and the immortality itself, if he happens to attain it, will not be likely to mend him much. Herr Wislicenus deals less in metaphysical moonshine than his compatriot, and seems to gain a glimpse of something like reality occasionally; but he is, for the most part, befogged in a very shallow rationalism.

REVIEWS AND MAGAZINES.

- 1.—*Allgemeine Kirchliche Zeitschrift. Ein Organ für die Evangelische Geistlichkeit und Gemeinde. Elberfeld, 1869, Achtes bis Zehntes Heft.*

THIS monthly is edited, with a corps of assistants, by the great rationalistic agitator, Dr. Schenkel; and, whatever we may have against the man, or against the theological party which he represents, we must confess that his *Zeitschrift* is the best edited and liveliest of all the popular religious magazines published in Germany. Its *résumé*, for instance, of the current news of the religious and theological world, is really excellent; and its frequent articles on the condition of the Church in different Christian countries are highly instructive, and many of them of permanent value. There are two such in the numbers before us: one by Prof. Dr. Wattenbach, of Heidelberg, on "Protestantism in Spain, and the Protestant Congregation in Madrid," and another in two parts, on "The History of the Evangelical Church in Transylvania during the last two Centuries." Dr. Wattenbach's article was originally delivered as a lecture to the students in Heidelberg, on the occasion of an appeal from the Protestants in Spain to their German brethren for encouragement and assistance. It is full of information concerning the origin and history of the present religious revolution in the country in question, and might be read with profit by many to whom it is now inaccessible. The article on the Church in Transylvania is all the more valuable from the fact that so very little is found on this subject in any of the various works on modern ecclesiastical history.

2.—*Unsere Zeit. Deutsche Revue der Gegenwart.* 1869. 21stes und 22stes Heft.

THIS is a semi-monthly magazine of the very first order, published in connection with the celebrated "Conversations-lexicon," of the well-known publisher Brockhaus, in Leipzig. We call attention to the above numbers as containing two important articles by Dr. Julius Frauenstädt, on "Arthur Schopenhauer and his Opponents." Schopenhauer was the most brilliant, if also the most persistently wrong-headed, of all the great German philosophers. A man of wide and many-sided culture, and of the most incisive intellect, he constructed a philosophical system of the universe based on pessimism, and developed a theory of practical prudence which was cynical to the last degree. For persons who know where they stand themselves, and are in no danger of being led astray by his eccentricities, we know of no more suggestive reading than the works of the Frankfort philosopher. Lotze of Göttingen used to say of him, in somewhat coarse, but, on the whole, appropriate phrase, "He is as full of thoughts as a dog is of fleas." But little noticed even in his own country for a long series of years, receiving no call to any university chair in philosophy, and being withal boundlessly conceited and self-asserting, he grew so morbid that it became a fixed idea with him that all the professors of philosophy in the country had banded together for the purpose of ignoring him. This so imbibited him that he could scarcely write a page without breaking out into the most scurrilous abuse of Fichte, Schelling, Hegel, and company, and of every body who in any way sympathized with them. The reaction against this was inevitable. Schopenhauer succeeded in breaking the silence which reigned about him, but the speech which followed has not been, for the most part, very complimentary. He has found but few adherents, and almost as many open opponents as he before imagined he had secret ones. The above articles, by his friend and apostle Frauenstädt, are devoted to answering the objections and criticisms that have been published by the following writers: Cornell, Seydel, Liebmann, Hartmann, Trendelenburg, Haym, Thilo, Suhle, Kiy. The defense is certainly able, as far as it goes; but, to our mind, there are logical blunders in the system of Schopenhauer, which, so far as we are aware, have not yet been exposed, and which, when exposed, will show it to be a castle floating in the air, gorgeous, it is true, but with no solid foundation to rest on.

3.—*Revue Chrétienne. Paris. Septembre, Octobre, 1869.*

THE chief articles in the last two numbers of our excellent contemporary are two, by the editor, M. de Pressensé, on "The State of Catholicism in France on the Eve of the Ecumenical Council of 1869," which are well worthy of the position they have found as an Appendix to the volume of Father Hyacinthe's Discourses, published by Putnam.

MISCELLANEOUS.

MESSRS. LEE & SHEPARD, of Boston, take the lead in this country in the publication of attractive Juveniles. Among their late publications we note the following: "*Down the Rhine; or, Young America in Germany*," by Oliver Optic. This is an interesting story of travel and adventure, and is characterized by the dashing, wide-awake style of its author. "*The Boy Farmers of Elm Island*," by Reverend Elijah Kellogg, will be heartily welcomed by the boys. "*The Young Detective; or, which Won?*" by Rosa Abbott, is the fifth of the Rosa Abbott Series, and a worthy companion of those that have preceded it. Two volumes—"Echoes from Home," a collection of songs, ballads, and other home poetry, by the author of "Chimes for Childhood," and "*Living Thoughts*," are from the same house, and are alike beautiful in their contents and mechanical finish. "*Hester Strong's Life-work; or, The Mystery Solved*," by Mrs. S. A. Southworth, is worthy of a much more extended notice than we can now give it. It is written in a vigorous and attractive style, and may be read with pleasure and profit by all.

G. P. PUTNAM & SON, New York, are publishing some of the best books of the season. We have received "*Letters from the East*," by William Cullen Bryant, written by that distinguished author during his visit to the Old World, in 1852-3. The publishers have put these letters in a beautiful dress, and they can not now fail to be generally read and admired. "*The Mystic Bell: a Wonder-Story for Young People*," is an unusually attractive volume of its kind, and as it is presented in the best style of the printers' art, it will surely be very acceptable to those for whom it is specially intended. "*On the Edge of the Storm*," by the author of "*Mademoiselle Mori*," "*Sydonie's Dowry*," etc., is a French story of great power, and discusses phases of life which ought to be interesting to American readers, especially at this time.

HARPER & BROTHERS, New York, have recently published some excellent school books, among which we would call particular attention to "*The Philosophy of Teaching*," by Nathaniel Sands. This work proposes a radical change in the present system of imparting instruction to youth. It proposes that pupils shall study nature as well as books, and contends that the museum, the chemical laboratory, and the workshop should find a place in all our institutions of learning. The same house has published a new edition of "*Upham's Mental Philosophy*," a work which has already a national reputation. "*A Greek Grammar for Beginners*," by William Henry Waddell, Professor of Ancient Languages in the University of Georgia, is a most excellent little work, and is worthy of the highest commendation.

"*The Parser and Analyzer*," by Professor Francis A. March, is a work for beginners, and is illustrated with diagrams and suggestive pictures. The plan is quite original, and seems to have many advantages, as it is intended to task the memory as little as possible, and perception and judgment as much as possible.

MESSRS. FIELDS, OSGOOD & Co., Boston, are publishing a beautiful household edition of W. M. Thackeray's Miscellanies. "*The Memoirs of Barry Lyndon, Esq.*," "*The History of Samuel Titmarsh*," "*The Great Hogarty Diamond*," and "*Burlesques*," make up the first volume; "*The Paris Sketch-book*," "*Memoirs of Mr. Charles F. Yellowplush*," "*The Irish Sketch-book*," and "*Notes of a Journey from Cornhill to Grand Cairo*," make up the second; while the third contains "*The Book of Snobs*," "*Sketches and Travels in London*," "*Dennis Duval*," and other stories. The same house have published "*The Village on the Cliff*," with other stories and sketches, and "*The Story of Elizabeth*," with other tales and sketches, by Anna Isabella Thackeray. These are uniform with the household edition of Thackeray's works, and will be most acceptable to American readers.

We have received three more volumes of MESSRS. CHARLES SCRIBNER & Co.'s "Illustrated Library of Wonders." "*The Intelligence of Animals*," with illustrated anecdotes from the French of Ernest Menault, is as interesting as a novel, and contains a large amount of valuable information. "*Adventures in the Great Hunting-Grounds of the World*," by Victor Meunier, contains many animated sketches of life among the wild animals; while "*Rameses the Great; or, Egypt 3,300 years ago*," by F. De Lanoye, will carry the reader back far into the past, and enable him to live over again a period that, until recently, was supposed to belong to pre-historic times.

ROBERT CARTER & BROTHERS, New York, send us the following: "*Tales from Alsace, or Scenes and Portraits from Life in the Days of the Reformation, as drawn from old Chronicles*," translated from the German. This is a really interesting and valuable book, and deserves a much more extended notice than we are able to give to it now. We hope to refer to it at another time. "*Little Effie's Home*," "*Shining Light*," and "*Bible Wonders*," are excellent Juveniles from the same house.

MESSRS. HURD & HOUGHTON, New York, send us "*The Two Baronesses*," by Hans Christian Andersen, and "*Stories from my Attic*," by the author of "*Dream-Children*" and "*Seven Little People and their Friends*," both of which shall receive further notice in our next number.

NOTE.—Several books, received too late for notice in this number, will be reviewed in our next.

EDITORS' TABLE.

HAPPY NEW-YEAR.—With this number of the *Quarterly* we send our greetings to its readers, and wish them, one and all, a happy new-year. The year that has passed was one of unusual activity in all the great departments of thought and action to the discussion of which the *Quarterly* is specially devoted. A year now is a life-time, when compared with former periods of the world's history. Ages are crowding into days as we approach nearer and nearer the period of universal unity—a period which we hope is not far distant in the future. What if time and space should be practically annihilated, even before the angel, with one foot upon the land and the other upon the sea, shall declare that time shall be no more! May it not be that an infinite Providence is gradually bringing the world to such a state as will require at last no miracle to usher in the prophetic future, when the kingdoms of this world shall have become the kingdoms of our Lord Jesus Christ? No matter whether this be so or not; one thing is certain, to be living now is truly sublime; and this fact should stimulate every earnest heart to labor untiringly for the conversion of the world.

LIFTING ONE'S SELF IN A BASKET.—Our article, in the last number of the *Quarterly*, entitled "The Church of the Future," has been very generally commented upon by both the religious and secular press. Several papers reviewed it at considerable length; and some of them, while expressing sympathy with its leading positions, do not seem to have fully comprehended its main thought. "*The Christian Leader*," of New York, thinks that the writer of the article was simply attempting, in his opposition to human creeds, to "lift himself up in a basket;" for the reason that those who denounce human creeds, and claim to take only the Bible as their rule of faith and practice, are themselves guilty of holding to the very things they denounce. We are inclined to think that the *Leader* is decidedly muddled on the creed question, as indeed many of our contemporaries seem to be. To all such we recommend a careful reading of the first article in our present number, which, though it may not convince them of the error of human creeds, will at least give them a clear conception of our position on the creed question.

OUR CONTRIBUTORS.—The names of the writers for the *Quarterly* will not appear till the last number of the volume, when due credit will be given to all. This rule makes every article stand on its *real* merits.